



Christian Order

NOV 21 1977

Summary of Contents for October 1977

DETROIT : A CALL TO REVOLUTION
IN THE CHURCH

Vincent P. Miceli, S.J.

ST. GEORGE AND "THE CHURCH
IRRITANT"

John Biggs-Davison, M.P.

THE FATIMA MESSAGE

Rev. Fr. Scahill

"TIME FOR BUILDING" : A
COMMENTARY : 1

Paul Crane, S.J.

GOD COMES BACK

Father Werenfried van Straaten

ANY QUESTIONS ?

William Lawson, S.J.

READERS

please be so kind as to note that new arrangements have been made recently with regard to the printing and distribution of *Christian Order*. As a result this October issue may be slightly delayed. We hope not, but we would like to warn you of the possibility and ask for your usual patience if there is a delay. May I take this opportunity of thanking you for your wonderful support and reminding you that a great deal of money can be saved if subscription renewals are sent in on the first reminder.—The Editor.

Contents

Page

- 578 A DELEGATE MATTER
The Editor
- 581 DETROIT : A CALL TO
REVOLUTION IN THE CHURCH
Vincent P. Miceli, S.J.
- 591 ST. GEORGE AND "THE
CHURCH IRRITANT"
John Biggs-Davison, M.P.
- 596 "TIME FOR BUILDING" :
A COMMENTARY : 1. The Editor
- 609 PASTORAL LETTER
Rt. Rev. Bernard D. Stewart
- 614 GOD COMES BACK
Father Werenfried van Straaten
- 627 WARSAW PACT COUNTRIES
AND AFRICA Czeslaw Jesman
- 630 THE FATIMA MESSAGE
Rev. Fr. Scahill
- 637 ANY QUESTIONS ?
William Lawson, S.J.
- 639 BOOK REVIEWS Paul Crane, S.J.

If You Change Your Address :

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows :

U.S.A., Canada
India, etc.—£4.00, U.S. \$8.00
Australia — £4.50, A. \$8.00
N. Zealand—£4.50, N.Z. \$8.00

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 18

OCTOBER, 1977

NUMBER 10

A Delegate Matter

THE EDITOR

LAST month's editorial drew attention to the complaisance, bordering on compliance, of the American Catholic Hierarchy in face of the destruction from within of the Faith in that country at neo-modernist and secularist hands. Earlier this year, the *New York Times* commented in a special article by Kenneth A. Briggs on what many would consider to be the most disturbing aspect of the present tragic state of Catholic affairs in the United States of America. The *Times* article referred to the apparently benign role played in this destruction by Pope Paul's diplomatic representative with the American Government, Archbishop Jean Jadot. It would appear that the Apostolic Delegate has placed himself none too unobtrusively behind the progressive drive to secularise the Catholic Church in the United States and which reached its high point at the Detroit Conference, which took place last year from October 21st-23rd under the title of "A Call to Action". Readers are advised to read Father Vincent Miceli's commentary on that Conference which appears in this issue. They will then understand why the apparent support given to it by the Delegate—before and after it took place—should give rise for concern.

In an editorial in the *Wanderer* (17/4/77), of which he is Editor, A. J. Matt, Jr, cited in the *New York Times* article, had this to say in criticism of the attitude and actions of the Apostolic Delegate in the United States. I quote the editorial in full because it states the case far better than I could and because it is important, in this context, that a distinguished American Catholic journalist should do the speaking:

"Kenneth Briggs of the *New York Times* has performed a singular service for Catholics in this Country with his profile of the progressive Archbishop Jean Jadot, Apostolic Delegate to the Church in the U.S. Prior to Mr. Briggs' published article, it was difficult to put into focus the uneasiness expressed by a number of concerned Catholics, clerical and lay, towards Archbishop Jadot. But the Briggs' article clearly outlines the reasons that give substance to the concern. He portrays a prelate who has thrown in his lot with those progressivists who have little patience with the fine points of orthodoxy and discipline (the stuff which traditionally keeps intact the fabric of the Church) in their eagerness to achieve justice through a social activism that is badly infected by secular humanist and socialist ideology.

"In a complete reversal of the traditional role of the Apostolic Delegate, whose function often is to lay a steady-ing hand on restive elements within a local church and to uphold orthodoxy and discipline where and when these may be undermined, Archbishop Jadot seems to have joined forces with the *avant garde* elements within the Church in this Country.

"The results of Archbishop Jadot's departure from the traditional functions of Apostolic Delegate and the concurrent emergence of a 'Jadot faction' among the Bishops are raising havoc with the stability of the Church in the U.S.

"At the notorious 'Call to Action' conference, where Church tradition and teaching were treated with contempt and Marxist ideology was rampant, Archbishop Jadot maintained his enigmatic smile for three long days without so much as a word of concern. And then, following the Detroit disaster, according to Mr. Briggs of the *Times*, the Delegate quashed an outpouring of concerned and critical reaction by a number of prelates by making known his unhappiness with some of the initial negative reactions. Meanwhile the 'Jadot faction' among the Bishops is vigorously promoting the 'Call to Action' recommendations.

"And when Bishop Dozier created a national scandal with his 'reconciliation service' the Memphis Ordinary was able initially to claim the support of Archbishop Jadot for his strange rites. Only after a storm of adverse reaction—including disavowals from Archbishop Bernardin (President of the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops) and criticisms from two Vatican Congregations—did the Dele-

gate deem it appropriate to separate himself from any apparent approval of Bishop Dozier's actions.

"The opposition of the 'Jadot faction' of bishops (the Delegate has been responsible for the appointment of 60 in the U.S.A.) to the Hierarchy's pastoral on moral values (reported extensively in *The Wanderer* of 11/25/76) succeeded in undermining the effectiveness of the document before it was even published.

"But more shocking than any other disclosure in the *Times* article was the revelation that it was Archbishop Jadot's 'displeasure with the way the top leadership of the Hierarchy responded to the two major Presidential candidates during the campaign, chiefly on the issue of abortion, that resulted in the leaders later declaring that they were politically neutral'.

"It was that declaration of 'neutrality', for whatever motive it was expressed, that practically destroyed the Bishops' moral credibility and effectively removed the abortion issue from last Fall's election contest.

"How someone allegedly so dedicated to social justice as is the Apostolic Delegate could have played a part in hobbling the Bishops on the most burning social justice issue of our times is hard to comprehend.

"For more than a decade, the Church in the United States has been wracked with disobedience, dissent and defiance. The Faith of millions of Catholics has been subverted and weakened by the divisions in the Church promoted by a host of clamoring and conflicting voices. We need a respite from this turmoil; we need to hear once again the clear, certain and confident voice of Rome. We have a right to expect Rome's voice to be echoed by Her Delegate. We have good reason to believe that such is presently not the case".

I would suggest that the above represents a very serious situation; not only because it shows an Apostolic Delegate departing from the traditionally neutral stance of his diplomatic office and adopting a partisan attitude, which is opposed to the transcendental mission of the Church he represents and divisive still further, of an already divided Catholic Body in the United States; not only this, which is obvious enough, but Archbishop Jadot's partisanship is clearly progressive and in aid of those forces which are working from within for the destruction of the Catholic Church in America.

That somewhat ridiculous document "A Time for Building", which is dealt with in "Current Comment", proposes, amongst other abominations, a National Pastoral Council for England and Wales next year. Readers are asked to read the following account by Fr. Vincent P. Miceli, S.J. of America's National Pastoral Council, held last year under the title of "A Call to Action" at Detroit and at a cost that ran into hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Detroit: A Call to Revolution in the Church

VINCENT P. MICELI, S.J.

ABOUT 1,340 delegates from 152 dioceses and 1,100 observers from around the nation met in Detroit from October 21, 1976 through 23 in a conference sponsored by the U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops as a culmination of the Church's Bicentennial Celebration. The theme of the conference was "A Call to Action". The purpose of the action was "Liberty and Justice for All". But the theme actually developed by the conference was "A Call to Revolution". And the purpose of the revolution was "A Classless Church for All". The following are the observations of this delegate who participated and represented the Confraternity of Catholic Clergy, a group counting close to 1,000 priests and 15 bishops, founded two years ago.

Now in every rigged convention there is a selected slogan patented by the planners and calculated to justify to the world their pre-arranged victory. I notice that *The N.Y. Times* was quick to catch and zealous in scattering to the journalistic winds the clever myth concocted by the directors of this conference. Giordano Bruno would have

cheered the astuteness that produced this tool of deception. *Se non è vero è ben trovato* : "If it is not true it is very well invented".

On October 22, *The N.Y. Times* tells us: "Although a broad array of church members are in Detroit, the character of the delegation is clearly reformist. . ." On the 24th we read in those august pages: "Roman Catholics from a broad spectrum of the church today neared the end of a three day conference . . . A remarkable cross section has now spoken . . . Like the (Eucharistic) Congress, the conference is largely a lay affair". On the 25th the same theme swells in intensity: "It (the conference) was the most representative meeting of the Roman Catholic church in its history in this country . . ." And, as if unable to cease singing the same song, the *Times* was on stage again, October 27, four days after the conference closed: "A diversified group of delegates took full advantage of a chance to recommend changes" is the subtitle to a growing wrap-up story on a meeting that sent *The N.Y. Times* into great expectations for the coming of a democratic Catholic Church founded on the revelations of progress and humanism. Within the body of the last article we read: "Delegates could hardly be described as belonging to fringe groups. They were chosen by bishops. They represented a wide assortment of people".

Who Chose Delegates?

The N.Y. Times' correspondent, Kenneth A. Briggs, author of all the articles quoted, parroted perfectly the slogan of the ruling radicals at the conference. But what were the facts? First, it is not true to say the delegates were chosen by the bishops. Most of the bishops had neither the time nor energy to choose delegates, nor did they know the majority of delegates from their own dioceses. For example, no bishop chose me. And the same was true of dozens of other delegates I met. The delegates were chosen by middle-management committees made up of new breed priests, liberated nuns and dissident intellectuals. Moreover, these bureaucrats chose delegates for the most part with mind-sets practically identical with their own on revolutionary solutions for religious, social and political problems. It was carefully estimated that forty

percent of the delegates were clergy. Women made up another forty percent; the majority of these latter were nuns, a few in religious garb, the overwhelming rest in secular attire, frequently in pants suits. Just how representative of the 49 million Catholics in the U.S. are such specialized types? Then too there were the other special interest groups of delegates — ex-priests, ex-nuns, homosexuals, minority caucuses for Christian Marxism, Socialism and Pacifism. At the bottom of the totem pole were the few Catholics who wanted to keep the historical Church, despite some questionable changes called reforms. If there was one glaring fact about the “Call to Action” conference, it was that the delegates by far did not represent the vast majority of American Catholics — neither bishops, priests nor laity. They did represent a miniscule core of intellectual insurgents, disaffected clergy, religious, ex-seminarians — all enthusiasts for the creation of an American democratic Catholic Church.

A few observations should be made on the general and particular meetings that formed documents and passed resolutions on religious and social questions. *The N.Y. Times* (October 27) tells us that these meetings “were a taste of the democratic process on the widest national scale . . .”. Nothing could be further from the truth. It was a common experience to see honest opposition cut-off crudely and silenced. Opponents of ruling radicals were often told “to stop making debating points, to cease referring to encyclicals, council documents and traditional teachings”. They were warned “to lay aside philosophical definitions and disciplined, coherent thinking”. Especially did the female chairladies insist that “they wanted input that emphasized religious experience and social concern”. Only thus could the documents on Church, personhood, family, ethnicity, work, humankind, neighborhood and nationhood become relevant to our times. Often when resolutions embarrassing to the ruling strategists were presented, the chairperson, with mind teeming with schemes, would slowly repeat the resolution, meanwhile motioning some ideologically kindred spirit to man a microphone quickly—such spirits hovered close to microphones everywhere. The carefully selected messenger would then move to end debate on the resolution. Another companion would quickly second the motion and the resolution was shouted

down by a vote that ended a discussion that never got started. This process went on *ad nauseam*; the meetings were in the hands of the haters of open discussion; they feared nothing more than intelligent dialectics. And they steamrolled the opposition through an abuse of parliamentary tactics that was in fact academic intolerance. For the manipulators were hell-bent on obtaining certain predetermined goals and they came prepared to brook no opposition.

Rebels Took Over

This became so clear from the very outset that John Cardinal Krol could not keep silent about it. In an interview with *The Detroit Free Press*, which printed his remarks in the Saturday October 23 issue, the Archbishop of Philadelphia made this complaint: "Rebels have taken over the conference". He then specified thus: "The conference was being manipulated by a few people who had received the support of a naive group of little ladies". Now the few people manipulating the meeting were agitator-priests, Saul Alinsky types. Indeed one of these Monsignori boasts continually that he is a spiritual child of agitator Alinsky.

Now Saul Alinsky, who died in 1972, is still very much with us as a charismatic leader. He is the author of two very influential books *Reveille for Radicals* and *Rules for Radicals*. A Marxist humanist and atheist, some brief thoughts and methods of the man will help us understand what went on at the Detroit conference. Alinsky teaches: "Truth is relative and changing; *everything* is relative and changing". And it is on this relativism that the organizer of a movement must thrive. For Alinsky the enemy is within and the war for change is to be waged within the community to be changed. He writes: "The first step in community organization is community disorganization . . . The organizer dedicated to changing the life of a particular community must first rub raw the resentments of the people of the community; fan the latent hostilities of many of the people to the point of overt expression. He must search out controversy and issues, rather than avoid them, for unless there is controversy people are not concerned enough to act . . . Any revolutionary change must be preceded by a passive, affirmative, non-challenging attitude toward change among the mass of our people. They must feel so

frustrated, so defeated, so lost, so futureless in the prevailing system that they are willing to let go of the past and chance the future . . . The job of the organizer is to maneuver and bait the establishment so that it will publicly attack him as a dangerous enemy. Such a counterattack then puts the organizer on the side of the people . . . A revolutionary organizer must shake up the prevailing patterns of the people's lives—agitate, create disenchantment and discontent with the current values to produce a passion for change". In this system religion becomes politics and politics becomes religion. And this explains why so many priests infected with the virus of Alinskyism, are enraptured at destroying the traditional Catholic Church.

'Western' Society Gets Blamed

The priest manipulators of the conference lived up perfectly to the coarse, crude methods of their mentor. Their tactics produced from their audience — delegates and observers — distorted reactions against the Catholic Church, the United States, the First World of the West, business corporations, the white man; all these hysterical reactions led to accusations of criminality against these sectors of Western society and to a frenzied cry to bring these sectors to their knees. No injustice, no war, no poverty, no sickness, no difference or restraint, however reasonable, but was used to condemn these sectors as responsible for all the evils in the world. The whole conference was an activity-oriented frenzy and propaganda orgy. Now "the naive group of little ladies" were, though the Cardinal was too charitable to specify them, the not-so-naive liberated nuns who responded with emotionally charged outcries, clappings and vote-acclamations to the wand-waving of their exalted leaders.

The anti-intellectual, anti-rational tone of the proceedings was spiritually suffocating. With a shock it dawned on me that I was witnessing a new, alarming, growing phenomenon in the Catholic Church. A movement of Catholic "Know-Nothings" was making a play for power in the Catholic Church. And their first move was to discredit their Church before the world by mounting a witch hunt against her, supposedly to uncover her injustices, her subversive political activity and her disloyalty to the ideals of her Master. In reality this witch hunt was meant to harass

and weaken the entire ecclesiastical structure. These agitated Catholics revealed themselves fully at the conference. They were ignorant of Catholic dogma, morals, canon law, philosophy, culture and history. But the most dismal aspect of their ignorance was that they did not give a tinker's damn about it. Indeed they gloried in their ignorance! Their contempt for truth was demonstrated every time they tittered against papal teachings and the age-old doctrines of their Church. Their contempt for justice and moral balance was demonstrated when they demanded that the Church change her doctrines on artificial contraception, abortion, the right to national defense, the right to private property, the right to reasonable profit. Their contempt for authority—divine and human—was demonstrated when they shouted against laws reasonably restraining the use of liberty, when they rejected the divine plan for salvation, when they resented such metaphysical and physical differences as God established in the diverse vocations, sexes and services for the salvation of man. Nor were these exalted souls really interested in "liberty and justice for all". They voted down a resolution presented by an eastern European group condemning tyranny behind the iron curtain. I had to check with a friend to make sure I heard correctly. He assured me I had. The reason given for the rejection of this resolution was that it was decided that "no anti-Communist statements were to be placed in any of the final documents. This would be too negative". Once again favorite treatment for the universal enemy, the pet of the rascal radicals. Of course, previously it had not been considered too negative to represent the Church, the West and especially the U.S. as the architects of tyranny.

A Demonstration Erupts

Some years ago Paul VI caused a world-wide commotion by speaking in his Wednesday allocution of the smoke of Satan seeping into the Church of God through the cracks in the walls of the faithful. On October 13, eight days before the opening of the Detroit conference, Paul VI told the world in his allocution that "the tail of the devil is functioning in the disintegration of the Catholic world". (*Corriere della Sera, 14 Ottobre, p. 7*). The allusion is to the Apocalypse where the tail of the dragon is said "to be dragging along the third part of the stars of heaven and dashing them

o earth". Without a doubt there was a demonic dimension at the meeting in Detroit. One need merely relate the dramatic event that occurred near the end. As resolution after resolution opposing the radicals was defeated and things were speeding up to allow participants to catch homeward bound planes, a group of four or five young men (they seemed to belong to the frustrated Eastern Europeans) quietly walked into the hall carrying a banner before a suddenly silenced and astonished audience. The banner read: "When you leave this city, take our red cardinal with you". A few policemen then went into action. They reached for the banner and were on the point of roughly ushering the young men out of the hall when cries from the audience mollified their conduct. "Take your violent hands off those men. They have a right to express their opinion". The policemen then restricted themselves to persuading the men to leave quietly. Suddenly the young men shouted in unison: "Judas, Judas. Traitor priests!" They continued this for some minutes as they slowly left the hall. And their voices were heard gradually dying away with the one word returning weaker and weaker: "JUDAS, JUDAS, Judas, Judas, Judas, Judas!"

Bishops Were Culprits

One has merely to read the list of over one thousand arrogant demands this conference made upon the Church to realize that its own psychological violence provoked the violence of the young men. The conference sat in judgment, in the chair of Peter not of Moses, on the Church. It preached downward to the hierarchy, scolding them, demanding a reform of their lives, and listing privileges they must give up at once, or at least share with the faithful.

As Russell Kirk wrote in *National Review*: "Call to Action was the monstrous baby of Cardinal Dearden of Detroit upon whom the Church had conferred responsibility for celebrating the Bicentennial". But when one reads Cardinal Dearden's report of the Detroit conference to the Bishops' meeting on November 9, 1976 in Washington D.C. one is surprised to find not a monstrosity but a darling child destined to bring great news to the Church of the future. How can one explain this wide divergance of opinion between two such distinguished persons? Let me attempt an explanation. It is within the setting of a fond

father evaluating the bizarre anatomical diversity and behaviour of a loved, though flawed, child that the Cardinal's praise of the Call to Action conference must be understood. We need not look for conscious distortions in such passages as: "We bishops were able to bring together what must surely rank as one of the more diversified assemblies in our history", even though many bishops explicitly disassociated themselves from the conference and many others lamented the fact that the conference was anything but deliberative. Rather, the explanation must be found in the fascination for exaggeration and the use of hyperbole in praising one's own creature. That fascination will suffice to explain this passage and others: "It could be said that the intelligence, enthusiasm and commitment of those who were chosen to attend the conference is a testimony to the discernment of the bishops who appointed them". This is the tactic of lulling the bishops to sleep on the disaster that was the Detroit conference by lathering them in flattery. Or take this passage: "People do expect us to continue the process by responding with decisive action where it is called for, and with honest disagreement where that seems necessary. The key to our actions in the future is to continue the process, to build on the hopes that have been awakened, to act upon our clear responsibility for the unity, fidelity and vision of the Catholic community". All this is but high-flown nonsense. The people do not wish the shouting and the tumult of Detroit to continue; they were scandalized at it; fears not hopes were awakened in them; they saw in the Detroit meeting not the responsible building up of unity, fidelity and vision, but rather the destruction of unity, fidelity and supernatural vision by a revolt against reason, revelation and the sacred authority of the Church. As an architect of the Call to Action, the Cardinal is open to an accusation of special pleading in attempting to whitewash his own creation. *Cicero pro domo sua* has been for centuries, indeed since the fall of Adam, the whitewash syndrome used to explain away failures. But it will not wash.

Even when he reluctantly admits "hasty, untidy, careless, even extreme" defects in the conference's proceedings, the Cardinal cannot leave the brush alone. "Yet even these flaws can be exaggerated", he writes. It is my contention as well as Russell Kirk's and many other delegates and observers at the meeting that the flaws were often so blas-

phemous that they could hardly be exaggerated. Indeed, because the Cardinal attempts to minimize these flaws one is scandalized at his carelessness over the seriousness of the situation. Here was a frenzied meeting in which disgruntled Catholics irrationally attacked the Catholic Church, Mystical Body of Christ.

In viewing the hysteria of the delegates, this writer was reminded of the truth of Dryden's poetic lines: "Great wits are sure to madness near allied . . . There is a pleasure, sure, in being mad, which none but madmen know".

Demands Were Made

The following are some of the conference's mad demands which the Catholic Church cannot grant without ceasing immediately to be the true Church of Christ. If she granted them, she would become a Church of the world, a snake pit of radicals. She would become a center of doctrinal, moral, chaotic disorder and psychoneurotic distress. The radicals demanded: 1) Divorced, remarried couples to receive Holy Communion while still living in adulterous unions. 2) Ordained women priests and bishops. 3) Women given the power to preach the Gospel with authority. 4) A reversal on the doctrine of artificial birth control. 5) A mitigation of the doctrine on abortion. 6) A teaching approving Marxism, Socialism and pacifism as doctrinally true and morally good practice. 7) A denial of the right to property and to reasonable profit. 8) The creation of a new Church, democratic, non-hierarchical in structure, a classless church.

The following are some of the demands the Church simply cannot fulfill for that is not her mission: 1) Wipe out poverty, ignorance, prejudice and war. 2) Democratize the whole world. 3) Stop the sale of arms everywhere. 4) Back the E.R.A. as a constitutional amendment. Like her Saviour, the Church will not turn stones into bread, thereby becoming the Mother of Socialism or a millenium of this world. Finally here are a few demands the Church will most probably not grant in the interest of her supernatural mission to make converts of all nations: 1) Allow married men to be ordained. 2) Allow priests to marry. 3) Revoke the vow of celibacy of priests and religious. 4) Lift the excom-

munication from divorced, remarried Catholics still living in adultery.

A final word of advice to Cardinal Dearden, Archbishop Peter Gerety and Msgr. John Eagan, prime movers at Detroit in the drive to create a democratic church of the future in a five year program. Such a democratic church will not be accepted by American Catholics, for such a church would be a man-made utopia, incapable of saving anyone. The Holy Spirit and the Vicar of Christ will preserve Catholics from such a sterile kingdom of this world. Bereft of Christ, such a church could only become an instrument of the Sons of Satan in their war against the flock of Christ. To loyal, perceptive bishops, priests and laity who still love their traditional, apostolic Church, it is of no small significance that the world is rejoicing over the debacle at Detroit. Such faithful souls know that when *The New York Times* rapturously reports the wild doings of a conference of Catholic enthusiasts and projects their redimensioned model of the Church as the inevitable Church of the future, then proper Church authorities better grab the holy water sprinkler and, if need be, the legal instrument of excommunication before it is too late. Only by at once applying these remedies vigorously (Alinsky would insist on the *vigorously*) will the temple of God be cleansed effectively of its iconoclasts and the true Catholic Church rescued from the savagery of latter-day malcontents posing as concerned Catholics. Superstition? Hardly. Rather security measures against outside agitators and inside traitors.

This article by John Biggs-Davison, MP is taken from a speech at a St. George's Day Dinner given at the Challoner Club on Friday, April 22nd of this year.

St. George and "The Church Irritant"

JOHN BIGGS-DAVISON, M.P.

THERE is the Church Militant. There is also the "Church Irritant!"

At a time of mass migration, mass travel and tourism and mass literacy the Western Church, heedless of the Pope's wishes and the Council's decrees, banishes Latin to holes and corners.

At a time of ecumenism, it deletes from its liturgy the vestigial Greek. While extending a brotherly hand to Jewry, the Church excises the fragments of Hebrew. One of the assets of the liturgical changes is that more of Scripture is included in the new rites. Why, then, is the "*domine, non sum dignus*", taken from the Gospel account of the Centurion, paraphrased out of recognition?

Triumphalism of the "Mike"

Triumphalism is out. It seems that enthronement is nowadays for Anglican bishops! Yet there is a new triumphalism, of the trendy theologians—and of the microphone. Catholics, like Protestants, are now "shopping around" for a "nice service", or to avoid the embarrassing idiosyncrasies of a celebrant who exaggerates his place in the mysteries and presumes to embellish the sacred liturgy with cosy improvisations and sentimental banality. I call it the triumphalism of the microphone; for in your bright modern puritanical church the "mike" has become the main adornment of the table that has been wheeled in to supplant the altar of old. So it was in the sixteenth and seven-

teenth centuries when Reformers and Roundheads proceeded from the suppression of the Catholic Church to the proscription of Anglicanism. In so doing, they provided ample precedent for our own reformers' tearing down of altar rails and other iconoclastic excesses. Finally, there is the new triumphalism of ecclesiastical bureaucracy. The clerical busybody clutches his brief case for *viaticum* and hurries from committee to commission. Let us award high points in this league to those in the Vatican who demoted some of the most beloved of Christian saints.

An Affront

No doubt there was laughter in heaven; but it was an affront to the Eastern Church and a setback to the ecumenical dialogue with Orthodox and Anglicans (who fly his flag more readily than, alas, do we) when the birthday in Heaven of St. George, April 23rd, 303 (it was Good Friday) ceased to be a Feast of the Universal Church. Gibbon had had a go in his day. The historian of the *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire* had no love of Holy Church, and he misled many with his false identification of the Great Martyr of the East with a fraudulent army contractor of the same name. The latter was not of Cappadocia but of ill-omened Laodicea whom the Arian heretics intruded into the Patriarchate of Alexandria. Unlike the Confessor, or St. Thomas More, the true George is the subject less of history than of tradition. Tradition may be encrusted with pious fable, or the embellishments of local tourist interests, but it can be more reliable than history, and there is no historical evidence even for all that we are bound to hold *de fide*.

A Long History

Since, however, the Church has gone archaeological, consider the antiquity of the devotion to St. George. He is found in inscriptions of as early as 346 A.D. His cult was observed in Trachonitis in 367. He was mentioned by St. Ambrose of Milan. It was not long after his martyrdom that the first church was dedicated to St. George in Rome. Pope Leo II rebuilt it and added another soldier, St. Sebastian. It was this Church of S. Georgio in Velabrio that

Pope Leo XIII gave to John Henry Newman as his titular church when he made him a Cardinal. The Great Martyr of the East gave his name to monasteries and churches consecrated by fifth-century Christians in Syria and Egypt. A hundred years later Christians of the West were doing likewise. In 594, St. Gregory of Tours recorded the great veneration of St. George. The Roman Beviary described how, when Constantine brought peace to the Church after the persecution of Diocletian, under whom he was martyred, churches dedicated to St. George were built near Lydda—the Royal Society of St. George presented a banner to the Orthodox church there—and in time the Faithful, first of the East and then of the West, cherished a wonderful devotion to him. Were they all wrong?

According to legend, this Roman tribune who, with a heroism and physical strength more than the natural courage of the valiant soldier, survived and later succumbed to incredible torments, told Dacian:

“My name is Georgious. I am a nobleman from Cappadocia. With the help of Christ I conquered Palestine, but I have left everything untouched so that I could serve God better in heaven”.

The Conqueror of Palestine appeared to Geoffroi de Bouillon at the siege of Antioch, and he became England's Patron at the time of Coeur de Lion and the Third Crusade. Chesterton relates the invocation of this “half mythical hero, striving in an eastern desert against an impossible monster”, to the emergence of an English nation.

“They left the numberless Saxon saints in a sense behind them, (and) passed over by comparison not only the sanctity of Edward but the solid frame of Alfred”.

Yet, according to Lingard, St. George was commemorated in the canon of the Anglo-Saxon Mass. As for the “impossible monster”, the English have long been partial to dragons. They used to be taken in Rogation procession before Ascension Day—as, for instance, Snap, the Norwich dragon, who was practically a civic dignitary thanks to the Guild of St. George. Edward VI confiscated the Guild's relics of the Martyr.

A Saint Shared

England shared her Patron with many — with Sicily, Genoa, Aragon, Barcelona, Valencia, Malta. St. George's Cross flies from the fortress commanding the capital of England's oldest ally, Portugal. From Spain to Russia, from the thirteenth to the nineteenth centuries, St. George inspired orders of chivalry, including that of the Garter, founded in 1330. In 1222, April 23rd was proclaimed a Holyday of Obligation in England. In the fifteenth century, the Archbishop of Canterbury ordained that the Festival be observed with the same solemnities as Christmas. The Feast was abolished by Elizabeth I but it bobbed up again under Gloriana's Stuart successor, James I. Shakespeare bears witness to the fervour of the devotion. James II, the last Catholic King, was crowned in Westminster Abbey on St. George's Day, 1685. In the eighteenth century Pope Benedict IV declared St. George to be Protector of the Kingdom of England. Naturally, he is also the Patron of Cavalry; you may see his fine statute on the memorial to the Cavalry of the Empire: a move to replace him with a tank never cranked up. In places, there was the custom of St. George's Ride. He is Patron of the worldwide and chivalrous Brotherhood of Scouts. Witness the St. George's Day parade before Her Majesty the Queen. St. George is depicted on panels, worked in silk or gold on chasubles, carved in stone and on Christian hearts. The colours of the Red Cross Knight are borne in many a battle flag, in the White Ensign and in the national flag of the United Kingdom and other Commonwealth Realms and Territories. The English complained when their Saint was put down; but they are a lazy lot until they are aroused. Imagine what would have happened if the Vatican had tampered with St. Patrick! His biography, too, is in parts obscure and disputed. Neither Saint is home grown. Our islands have always been lands of immigration—of raiders, missionaries, merchants, planters, conquerors, exiles. The origins of many of them were at least as distant as the Levantine habitat of St. George.

St. George is Ours

He is ours but we have and desire no proprietorial claim. We are insular people who must needs look outward

and go forth in order to live and to prosper. We have been a province of Imperial Rome—and of Western Christendom. We are renewing old European ties. Spiritually, we are “part of the main”. St. George is not a mascot to lend tone to a civic celebration, boost the boozy sales of St. George’s Taverns, or bring the country luck. April 23rd is more than the birthday of the national bard—though that was no mean occasion for England and for Europe. St. George is a Protector needed as never before to beat down the dragons of fashion and fallacy that besmirch the values and assail the hallowed traditions that were the greatness and glory of England; for they derived from the Faith of our fathers.

The age is dark; but there is no call for despair. For Christians there is no determinism: history is not our escalator; history is made by God and man. And all the while St. George is in Heaven and God, as Chesterton said in the book already quoted, “has pity of this great land”.

Michael Davies

Now Ready

Two New Pamphlets

The Tridentine Mass 30p (post-free)
(U.S.A. \$1.00)

The New Mass 30p (post-free)
(U.S.A. 75 cents)

Both pamphlets together post-free 60p or \$1.50.

Order from: Augustine Publishing Company, South View,
Chawleigh, Chulmleigh, Devon EX18 7HL.

This is the first of three letter-articles offered in comment on "A Time for Building", the Report of the Joint Committee on Pastoral Strategy which was published earlier this year. In it, Father Crane criticises, amongst other things, what he sees as the tendency of the Committee to take for granted the social situation as it exists in Britain today.

CURRENT COMMENT

Time for Building : A Commentary

1: SHIFTING SANDS

THE EDITOR

My Lord,

THIS letter is addressed to yourself not in any personal capacity, but as Chairman of the Joint Working Party on Pastoral Strategy, which produced its Report entitled *A Time for Building* earlier this year. This letter is the first of three in comment on that Report.

Ambiguities and Double-Speak

Incidentally, I hope that future publications published by Working Parties such as yours will be dated. There are now so many of them coming out from various official and semi-official sources within the Church in this country that it is now more than ever necessary to have the year and month, at least, of their appearance clearly indicated. The alternative is increasing confusion, which is hardly a suitable basis for the kind of effective planning you and your Committee so ardently desire. Or is it? This depends, I suppose, on the kind of planning you want. There are indications in your Report that what your Committee means by planning and what it may have in mind here is the

imposition on the many of the viewpoint of a few, the few being yourselves; in other words, Democratic Centralism as found today in the Soviet Union and, I am afraid to say, increasingly frequently within the Catholic Church. Mental confusion, of course, is assisted enormously when the minds of the rank-and-file are befuddled with a continued out pouring of what is known, somewhat vulgarly, as semi-official bumf. Mind you, I am making no accusations; only saying that if this is what the new bureaucracy within the Catholic Church in this country has in mind, however sub-consciously, you are doing what needs to be done to achieve its aim—bombarding us with print; and an added point—seemingly wrapping up what you write in an ambiguity of phrase and a general vagueness that leaves the mind permanently confused and, in consequence, mentally adrift. I find it ironical, indeed, that, in a Report that pleads for more information to be showered on the Faithful in virtue of what you appear to think of, later on in your Report, as the vital need for increased and improved communications within the Church, you and your Committee should reveal yourselves as almost totally unacquainted with the most elementary basis of this art. For your Report, My Lord, appears to me as larded over with ambiguities and what I will call, with respect, double-speak, to the point where it is virtually incomprehensible.

This for a start, but it needs to be said. In the course of two studied and careful readings of your Report I find that I have set more than 100 notes in its margin, mostly queries. It could be, of course, that I am a particularly dull type, lacking altogether in those “insights”, which you and your Committee think of as little short of essential, I imagine, for the members of what is called today the post-conciliar Church. Nevertheless, with your cry throughout your Report, for the all-round participation of Catholics in in the work of the Church, ought you not to take into account the blockheads within it as well as those who have brains? Or, are the observations of yourself and your Committee aimed only at the latter? If they are, then you and your Committee are made to appear as would-be progenitors within the Church of a new—and, at the same time, very old—brand of Gnosticism; the favoured ones

on a hot-line to the Almighty, whose task is to take charge of the rank-and-file of the Catholic proletariat and give them what is good for them. If this is not the case and your message is for all of us, then I must ask you, with respect, to speak clearly and unambiguously if you want to communicate with the great mass of Catholics in this country. Most members of that mass, I venture to observe, will not have understood a word of what you are saying. I cannot blame them, for I am one of them and, after two hard readings, I find your Report more or less incomprehensible.

In consequence—and understandably, I think—I have asked myself how on earth I can tackle this document of yours. Getting hold of its essential points and building an ordered critique round them is about as easy as holding a live eel in your hands for more than two seconds after you have yanked it out of the water. All I can do, I think, is take your Report as it comes and say what I have to say about it; trying, at the same time, to make as much of a synthesis of my critique as possible. I see no way out of this difficulty for myself or, indeed, for my unfortunate readers. I offer them my profound apologies; at the same time, my congratulations on their luck, for they, at least, can put this piece of mine down; but—poor devil that I am—I have to write it. Anyway, here we go.

What is Ecumenical Pastoral Strategy?

My queries begin at the very outset of this Report, even with its Preface. There you write, “throughout the report we have kept in mind the belief expressed in *The Church 2000* that ‘the pastoral strategy of the Church must be ecumenical’”. What does this mean? Is it to be an obscuring of values, a bending of doctrine, a permissiveness of morals and a secularizing of the Church’s primary task to suit, say, the “secular ecumenism” of the World Council of Churches, which is itself seen as an instrument essential to what is thought of by the W.C.C. as the present, primary and most pressing task of Christians in the world; no more and no less than human betterment in aid of the advancement of mankind? Is this what your Committee has in mind here—horizontalism in excelsis; a Church made by men and their needs as opposed to men and their needs made by the Church and its teaching? I don’t know. All I do know is

that every action of a Catholic in aid of God's truth must itself be ecumenical because the object of true ecumenism can only be unity in that truth which is wholly within the Catholic Church. "So let your light shine before men that it may glorify my Father who is in Heaven"; a Catholic who spends his life quietly and steadily serving God's truth will draw men to himself as his Master did before him. You need have no doubt with regard to the truly ecumenical effects of such a life, My Lord. They will be profound. Surely, you realise this. Why, then, in your Report, do you and your Committee not encourage Catholics more closely to follow Christ in the Church? I see little trace of this kind of thinking in your Report, with its emphasis on framework, apparatus and techniques. Without true apostles filled with the love of Christ these are no more than a load of twisted scrap. Surely you see this. Yet you go on talking in your Report about the need for the introduction of a new apparatus within the Church of what we used to call the apostolate; and the streamlining of the old. Why? Since this kind of talk took over hard on the heels of Vatican II, the yearly number of converts to the Catholic Church in this country has dropped to an all-time low. You must be aware of this. Is there not, then, in your view and that of your Committee a connection between the present decline in the number of converts and the stressing of new ecumenical structures at the expense of the supernatural life of the members of the Catholic Church. You must be aware of this connection. If so, why do you act as if it did not exist?

A False Antinomy

In paragraph 3 of your Preface we have the first of a fair number of examples of double-speak in your Report, in the shape of a false antinomy. Of those people who disagreed with your concept of the Church's mission, as set out in your previous Report, *The Church 2000*, you write: "These people felt that the emphasis in the Church should be on conservation of essential Christian values in the face of a hostile world, rather than a developing involvement in the world". But the point against this presentation of yours is that you cannot have one without the other—the conservation of Christian values in the face of a hostile world is

essential to *effective* Christian involvement within that world. Surely, this is no more than elementary sense; yet, you present the conservation of values on the one hand and involvement, on the other, as opposites. I am forced to the conclusion, in consequence, that, for you, involvement need not necessarily be on a basis of values. *Orthopraxis*, as the jargon of the moment has it, in place of *orthodoxy*; in other words, old doctrine is out and you learn the new in the doing. Is this what you and your Committee are after, My Lord? I can set no other interpretation on your posed antinomy. I am, therefore, filled with a certain dismay, for what is here revealed by implication is the extent to which you and your Committee have come under the influence of Teilhard's bogus evolutionary theses, of process theology in all its forms and of Marxism—immersion in the collectivity is all; therefore, the true Christian's place is in it. What he encounters therein, of course, is a supposed dialectic of growth; what he ends up with is a new faith. Unfortunately, this is not the Faith of his Fathers. That has come to him from Christ through the Catholic Church; only when he is possessed by the teaching and truth of that Faith can he help shape the world in Christ's footsteps. The alternative is absorption into its valuelessness; in the footsteps, not of Christ, but of the mob, picking up its butt-ends and declaring them king-size cigarettes. Is this what you want for today's Catholic, My Lord? I am sure you don't, but your words could carry this interpretation. Moreover, involvement of Christians with the world and their increasing absorption in it is already producing within them the results enumerated above. The point is not, as you would appear to imply, that involvement will not destroy Catholic life and values. It is, rather, that effective apostolic and Christian involvement is impossible without them. This, I am afraid, is what you and your Committee do not see. You would have done so fifteen years ago. Your failure to do so now measures, as well as anything I know, the extent of the failure of post-conciliar reform; what your Report calls "renewal". Its trouble is that it is stained with the secular; concerned primarily with the advancement of man and not with the Kingdom of God. This is the undertone one senses running through its pages.

Contemporary Britain Taken for Granted

It is marked in your Introduction. One is sharply aware of it in paragraph 7; in this way, that you there appear to me, by implication at least, to take for granted the present pattern of this country's life when you should, as a Catholic, be questioning it; assigning to the Church—again by implication—the job of filling in what public authority has left still undone in the task it has set itself since World War II. That task may be described not unfairly as controlling the lives of this country's citizens; not of set purpose, but by setting over their living a well-meant, humanitarian apparatus which has had this inevitable result. In this Introduction to your Report, there is no indication, even by implication, that you are aware of the moral invalidity of this proceeding. It would appear that you take for granted on moral grounds the present social and economic set-up of this country. Thus you write, at the outset of paragraph 7: "Our present society, however, is characterised by a common feeling of powerlessness in the face of a vast and anonymous system. This feeling is shared by people of differing values and world views. They have lost confidence in the power of politicians to improve society". But of course they have—and very rightly too—because it is the politicians who have created the system that makes them feel powerless. Can you and your Committee not see this, My Lord; that the Welfare State, which is the creature of politicians, has robbed the citizen of responsibility and self-reliance and combined with increasingly centralised control over industry and social life to take the destiny of the citizen and that of his family out of his own hands, so that he is, in fact, powerless—in face of what he thinks of as a vast and anonymous system—to make his own way forward, as is his natural right and that of his family, in freedom under God? But that system, in face of which understandably he feels so powerless, has not just grown of its own accord. It has been manufactured by men out of a falsely materialistic social philosophy, which has little or no understanding of the true demands of human dignity. What I find painful in the whole of this paragraph and, indeed, throughout the whole of your Introduction, is that you and your colleagues appear to be as unaware of human

dignity's true demands in the social and political fields as the well-meaning humanitarians who have put us in our present mess. You appear to take for granted as socially sound what they have created and see the task of the Church as one of papering over the cracks that are discernible at different points in their system. But what exists—if I may so remind you with respect—is not necessarily good just because it exists. It could be bad. And the task of the Catholic ethicist—as distinct from the primary task of the Catholic Church in this or any country—is, first, to investigate its contemporary society in the light of Catholic Social Principle; then see what needs to be done. But all you appear to do in your Introduction is to accept Britain's present socio-economic situation, then tell us, in a concluding paragraph (18) that "The Church shares (accepts?) the situation and works within it".

Social Modernism

Clearly the Church shares this situation in the sense that she is now stuck with it; and, indeed, she must work within it as she must work within any adverse socio-political situation where her primary supernatural mission of bringing God's truth to men is concerned. She can do this, however, and, at the same time, work in ancillary fashion for the application of Christian social principles to public life in order that, therein, conditions may be established that accord with human dignity. What I find disturbing, however, is your apparent inability to recognise the moral distortion of contemporary British society and, in consequence, the need for investigation in the light of true social principle and, then, subsequently and where possible, persevering action in aid of human dignity. You and your Committee seem to me to be content with the present shape of society as so many of your episcopal colleagues before you, in this country and on the mainland of Europe, were content, in their turn, with theirs and became guilty, thereby, of what Pope Pius XI called "Social Modernism", suiting their moral stance, subconsciously mostly, to the social and economic climate of the times in which they lived and which they made no real move to change; tied to the contemporary establishment—as you are tied to that which presides in Britain today—and unwilling, in conse-

quence, to question it on a basis of principle. As it was in the first half of this century, My Lord, so it is now. You and your colleagues, not only on this Committee, but, I am afraid, in the Episcopate, appear to me as backing away from your duty of at least encouraging the examination of contemporary British society in the light of Catholic Social Teaching—as distinct from the meanderings of “liberation theology”—still less doing any thing about it.

Meanwhile, I note in passing some very questionable statements in the pages of your Introduction, with which this, the first of three letters concerning your Report, is mainly concerned. I would like to pause for a moment or two on a few of them. Pressure of space allows no more.

Contemporary Violence; Nothing to Say

Take this for a start, still from paragraph 7: “All forms of violence are growing—violence as organised protest in industry and politics; vandalism and meaningless violence in urban life. Society experiences this violence but is unable to explain it”. I would have thought, without any wish to seem arrogant, that the explanation is not all that difficult. If the family is robbed through State Welfare, not only of self-reliance and responsibility, but of the opportunity to bring up its children, which is found in the self-sacrifice called for in a daily family round that is based on both; if this is the case, as it is today in contemporary Britain, then I do not see how children, deprived of the values which that round alone can impart, will fail to be anything but feckless and, often, violent from time to time. Frustration will drive them that way; so, too, will the permissiveness of contemporary education and the sexual suggestiveness which is flung at them at almost every turn of their teenage lives. So, too, if you want to give (admittedly superficial) completion to this story, will the constriction of responsible opportunity that confronts them in their working lives as a result of centralised government control over industry at one end of the industrial spectrum and impersonal trade-union domination over their workaday lives at the other. Violence offers at least a temporary break-out from the dull monotony and the lonely impersonality of the near Hell which is now their working day. I cannot blame the young, particularly, for seeking escape from it in violence. Those.

whom I do blame are the members of your generation and mine, of every type and class, who made no move when government—Tory as well as Labour—took so much, so immorally of the average citizen's responsibility for his own life and that of his family into their own hands and deprived him, thereby, of the opportunity of living at the level demanded by his dignity as a human being. Violence, at base, is no more than a break-out from that kind of deprivation. I would have thought this sufficiently obvious. I know, of course, that your introduction is essentially descriptive; but I do think that, in it, you should have given indication that you are acquainted, at least, with the immoral basis of the rot at present pervading contemporary Britain. This you do not do. As I said a moment or so ago, the impression given the reader is that you take for granted the present set-up in England and Wales and see the Catholic Church's role therein as that of papering over the cracks in a system which you do not appear to recognise as wrong because constructed without consideration for the true and legitimate claims of human dignity. I do not think, in consequence, that you will get much response from your call to action on this front. What is wanted is not vague patching in support of a wrongly based social system, but—in conjunction with and ancillary to the Church's primary supernatural task of extending to men through time the fruits of Christ's Redemption—perservering action in aid of the application to contemporary society of those great Catholic Social Principles which are essential to the upholding of the claims of human dignity. If I may say so with respect, there is no sign in your Report that this sort of action is in any way contemplated by yourself and the members of your Committee.

Contemporary Expectations; Nothing to Say

Again, we are told in paragraph 8 that, "People now expect more from life; a longer life, freedom from economic pressures, better material standards, security in sickness and old age, more respect as persons". There is, once again, no indication here that you do anything but approve of these expectations, mainly materialistic that they are, or question whether any real desire to work honestly and

honourably for the realization of these desires is present in the minds of those—of every class in this country—who clamour so loudly for them. Something for nothing is the motto now of increasing numbers in the United Kingdom. Because it is, the number of unemployed is converging on 1½ million as I write these lines. I am not expecting you to comment at length on this situation in your admittedly descriptive Introduction on the state of this country. What I would ask for, however, and what I think not merely appropriate, but essential would be a flicker of recognition at least that something for nothing is not a motto that can be endorsed by those who value human dignity and recognise, in consequence and as totally legitimate, its demand for the opportunity of responsible activity in their working as well as their family lives.

Population Increase; Nothing to Say

Switching over to another field, take this from paragraph 10: "Although population growth in England and Wales is at present nil, people are disturbed by the world-wide increase in population and the consequent stress on living space and food producing resources". Frankly, I do not think that the mass of people in this country are disturbed in the way you make out or that the strain on living-space and food-producing resources is anything like as serious as you appear to indicate. Ironically enough, as I write these lines, a widespread and bumper harvest has been forecast for practically all the great grain-producing areas of the world. So much so that men are already asking themselves where the stuff is going to be stored. No doubt, in the United States, they will have to make use, once again, of the deserted cinemas and other emergency facilities which were full of wheat some years ago, but emptied soon afterwards in answer to desperate calls from the Soviet Union, which was suffering from a heavy shortage of cereals. This, however, could be considered as no more than a short-term phenomenon. Looking longer, the following figures from Dr. Colin Clark—as sage an expert in this field as anyone I know—are worth considering. They were made some years back, it is true, but their basis is as sound now as it was then. Clark reckoned, at the time, that, if you put the

inhabitants of the world into the United States, the density per square kilometre of the world population in that country would be 300 people. Yet the Netherlands has a density of over 300 people per square kilometre and, at the same time, the Netherlands is a food *exporting* country. Here clearly, is an indication of what the application universally of a first-class agricultural technique could do. Secondly, Clark has estimated that, if the cultivable land of the earth were farmed at Dutch standards, it could support, in a very fair degree of comfort, 10 to 15 billion people. And lastly—once more according to Clark—world population at the time he presented these figures was increasing at one per cent per annum, whilst the rate of technical improvement in agriculture was improving at one and a half to two per cent per annum. Therefore, at the time of his writing, there would seem to have been no particular reason why world population should not increase at an improving standard of diet for as long as could then be foreseen. As stated earlier, these figures are still as valid now as they were when he first wrote them.

Where malnutrition is concerned — that hare was let loose by the Food and Agricultural Organization; again, a good many years ago. It was said by the FAO at the time that half the world's population was suffering from malnutrition. Pressed for the sources of this statement, the FAO was forced to admit that they defined as malnourished anyone who did not eat like the inhabitants of Western Europe, large numbers of whom are not so much under- as over-fed! This is not to deny that there is hunger and suffering and disease—far too much of it in what is called the Third World; but a great deal of it is man-made. Indiscriminate slaughter in too many cases, pervasive corruption at the administrative top and appalling mismanagement have undoubtedly been responsible these past twenty years for far more hunger and disease than the outrunning of food supplies by population growth. Yet concentration is on the supposed population problem and not on the other causes of hunger, disease and death, including the religious apartheid of the caste system in India, which condemns tens of millions in that great sub-continent to go hungry most of the time. There is, once again, in your paragraph dealing

with world population, no apparent recognition that any factor other than rapidly increasing population is responsible for the presence of hunger and malnutrition in the world in which you and I live. Were there such recognition, policies very different from those seemingly advocated—at least by implication—by yourselves would be required.

Young Marrieds; Nothing to Say

Let me take next one point from your paragraph (11) on the family and then, in conclusion, a point or two from paragraph 12, which touches on woman and her place in the scheme of things. You write in paragraph 11 that “increased education”, amongst other things, has given young couples the opportunity of living independently of the extended family, so that “they are forced to rely greatly on their own resources”. You add that the increasing number of marital breakdowns suggests that, for many, “the expectations are too great and the resources too limited to cope with the situation”. Once again, there is little indication of your recognition that, increasingly today, for reasons already enumerated, the question is one, not so much of young couples being forced to rely on their own internal resources, as of their having no forces of their own to rely on, due to the destruction of family life and upbringing at the hands of the Welfare State and an increasingly permissive — as distinct from merely “increased”— education, which would appear to be the rule today. From your approach to this kind of problem, I would gather that, once again, you and your Committee see yourself in the guise of repair-men; tending the human wreckage that is strewn in the wake of the Welfare State; but never questioning it in the light of moral principle.

Sex Equality; Nothing to Say

Again I would agree with you in paragraph 12 that “equality for women is a major social influence of our time”; but I would have thought that, for a Catholic committee, the question, surely, is whether the influence is good or bad; whether, for example, the relegation to the background of woman’s most priceless asset, her femininity, is to be considered as a gain or a major social disaster. Once more,

there is no indication here or elsewhere in your Report that you have the collective mind to do anything, but take the present state of affairs for granted. Certainly, there is no indication of what your judgment is in this matter. So one might go on.

Principle or Expediency

And so one is left with the thought, at the end of your Introduction, as to where to go—or, more accurately, perhaps—where you are going from here. (For I know where I am going; which is right away from you.) What you have given us in this introduction is a picture—necessarily superfluous, I grant you; but without any indication—even by implication — whether you approve of it or not. “The Church”, you say in the last paragraph of your Introduction, “shares this situation and works within it”. Certainly she works within it, as she has to work within any situation where her primary, supernatural objective is concerned; but the other question—utterly neglected by yourselves in this Introduction—is whether she approves the situation in contemporary Britain and on what grounds. To this you give no answer, here in your Introduction or elsewhere in your Report, which is entitled, somewhat grandiosely, “A Time for Building”. But what do you want to build on and on what kind of foundation—the bedrock of principle or the shifting sands of expediency? No indication is given in your introduction or elsewhere. I would rate this as one of several major deficiencies in your Report; of a kind, indeed, hardly calculated to inspire confidence in its contents as a whole.

(To be continued)

TIME TO RETURN

“We have had the years of experiments in the Church and those experiments have failed. The Church should return to pre-conciliar times. The Council sowed the wind and has reaped a whirlwind”. —The Archbishop of Braga and Primate of Portugal, as quoted in *Bulletin du Cercle d'Information Civique et Sociale* for February 1st, 1977.

We are happy to reprint for the benefit of our readers this Pastoral written by the Bishop of Sandhurst and read in all churches of his Diocese in Australia on Pro-Life Sunday.

Rt. Reverend Bernard D. Stewart

LIFE is a great good. Each one of us is God's particular creation. That we be a family of one race, we are blood-tied in a common ancestry and nature, man and woman being the instruments of God's creative work. Where He is creator, they are procreators. Sacred Scripture sees man corporal and then spiritual: "Then the Lord God formed man from the dust of the earth and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living being". In that living being, the soul of man is like to God: "Let us make man in our own image and likeness", so run the words of the biblical text.

Man, thus dignified above the rest of creation, was further and, likewise gratuitously, honored by his elevation to a supernatural state. His fall from that state left him bereft and deprived of God's grace, with sin victorious and death its consequence. So he would have remained if God had not intervened; "God so loved the world He sent His own Son". The life of man, because of the advent of God into the life-stream of human history, took on a new dimension: "Whereas sin did abound, the grace of Christ did more abound". We have the God-man's own words: "I have come to give life and to give it more abundantly". This He made possible by His death in the agony of crucifixion. Death held Him but briefly and He rose on the third day. Where Christ has gone, He awaits us in the Kingdom of His Glory. Though our mortal life is a great good, it is but a shadow of and the necessary prelude to a life beyond all human reckoning, the possession of the Infinite Good, Who is God: "O Beauty, ever ancient, ever new".

A Strange Madness

It is with these thoughts in our minds that we must approach the great struggle that is tearing mankind apart, the ancient struggle between good and evil, but with increased intensity. A strange madness has come upon us because the concept of life as good in itself is increasingly being replaced by the concept of the quality of life, strictly limited and controlled during the brief years of mortality, with the grave man's destiny and total extinction his fate. Once this concept takes hold, there immediately begins the jettisoning of those values which show life good and expectant of ultimate happiness; thus making man follow faithfully the laws of his nature and strive for the "reward exceeding great".

He who runs may read the history of our times, especially the results of this fatal flaw in man's condition. Once remove the value of one life and all life is in jeopardy. The last few years have seen this threat in no uncertain manner. Man, without God, becomes a pitiful creature, claiming self-sufficiency and self-determining. He despises the law of his being; derides the commandments of God and rejects Christ, blood-brother of his nature and Author of his existence. We are witnessing a perversion in man's attitude to life and a rapidly spreading corruption, threatening to engulf men and nations. This is made most manifest in the procreative powers of human nature where too often lust masquerades as love; where, in frightening increase, life is divorced from love's ordained action. For many, pleasure becomes the main object of sexual activity and any barrier to it must be destroyed. Life is dammed at its source. God's laws are spurned in the refusal to transmit their life-giving and selfishness runs its inevitable course to sadness and frustration. The unease of more than half a century ago has largely been dissipated. Venus has claimed her ancient throne and once more offers her meretricious gifts, so often bringing their own physical and aptly named stigma, apart from the loss of the nobility and dignity of being partners of Life's Author in life-giving. Once the separation of life from love is accepted almost as a normal condition, then it follows logically that nothing, not even another's life, must interfere with fruitless sexual satisfac-

tion. Devious and aberrant ways of procuring ways of sensual excitement are avidly sought and no law of restriction is recognised. So perversion ranges through the whole sinful gamut of fornication, adultery, homosexuality, rape, incest and abortion, not to speak of the abominations of bestiality.

Descent into Depravity

Society has come with startling rapidity to a condition which indicates a horrible descent to the depths of depravity. If the life of another becomes a bar to pleasure, social or economic well-being or a health hazard, then let it be forfeit, urge the strangely misnamed humanists. So the womb of the race is transformed into an unnatural trinity bent on its destruction; legislators, playing God, parents sacrificing their young, executioners, dishonoring their profession. What words can be too strong and condemnatory of such brutal and murderous a one-sided onslaught? What fate awaits a race so defiant of God's Laws, so pitiless to its unborn brothers and sisters? Already the mark of Cain is made manifest while Mammon finds growing numbers of worshippers, eager for the profits from the sordid trade, attendant on this human carnage. The fees of the executioners are in the highest bracket; referral services are thriving with their exorbitant costs and there are not lacking the ghouls who batten on the pitiful remnants of the cruelly slain, God's children, made in His Likeness.

Valiant Pro-Lifers

Today, truly human and valiant ones take up the cause of the innocent, crying to be born. Their cries, sometimes audible, bring no response of pity as they are mangled and ripped from life's sanctuary; or vacuum sucked like refuse to be discarded; or burned and shrivelled by saline injection. These pro-lifers are greatly to be admired for their courage. They have to meet the sneers and jeers of the "permissive" society; to resist the pressures of insidious and powerful propaganda and, to their sorrow, find enemies where they would expect to find friends and allies, in the household of the Faith.

Hypocrisy to Murder

How can men and women of our time bemoan and wail for the baby seals cruelly clubbed to death by avaricious hunters in the interest of befurred women, and see no cause to shed tears over the slaughter of babies in their mothers' wombs? Let us not add hypocrisy to this cruel and wanton murder; let us cry out to God for His little ones, bereft of life and life's expectancy; let us not be silent and so acquiescing in the evil of governments, permitting these atrocities; of judges, seemingly unmindful of life's meaning and life's ultimate judging as they presume to interpret human law in defiance of God's eternal decree; of those who willingly stain their hands, expert for healing, with blood, like unto their own life-giving stream. Let us pray for the unnatural ones who sacrifice flesh of their own blood; let us not be unheard when men of repute in the community, both in Church and State, lend their voices and prestige to the unholy crusade against the innocent of the womb. To our shame they are numbered among our own moral theologians and to our amazement and dismay we read a reported recent interview in which a visiting Anglican Prelate admitted to favouring abortion in some circumstances.

Selective Indignation

We are living in a violent age when human life has become of little worth, expendable even for trivial reasons. Society has been hardened by the massive slaughter of two world wars; by minor wars, but costly in human lives; by the rise of terrorism and the continuing portrayal of violence. Occasionally, particularly brutal massacres of whole communities shock the sensitivities of the people. We were appalled at the genocides committed by Hitler, Stalin, Mao-Tse-Tung and other ruthless tyrants. It is worthy of comment that of these the name of Hitler is invoked as the apotheosis of evil, while the other mass murderers escape with little more than a reprimand because, we are told, they sought the good of the whole people and blood-letting had to be part of the due process. When there is selective indignation we can justly protest its genuineness. All human life is equally sacred, and all destruction of it

equally to be condemned at whatever state it has reached from conception to dissolution. Why we ask, when men are rightly incensed and cry out against human slaughter, is there immense silence in so many quarters before a holocaust which already is in line with the homicidal horrors of our century, and bids fair to outstrip them? Are men and women becoming blind to this blood-letting which is growing rapidly into a mighty stream ?

Our Own Responsibility

What, however, of our own responsibility, is a question we must ask? Do we contribute in any way to this heinous crime of murder? We would cry out indignantly against such a suggestion. Let us not be too sure. There is the question of co-operation which must be seriously considered. We must examine this question closely and will surely find cause for moral anxiety. If we were asked to pay for an abortion, we would be outraged. What, however, when a Government, acting beyond its charter, allots funds so to do and we are the providers of such funds? Surely, we must act to the utmost of our ability and, if needs be, risk demanding the withdrawal of the authorisation of such fundings.

Our obvious course is to bring pressure to bear upon the Government through our local parliamentary representatives, protesting strongly in interview and in writing against this grave violation of human rights. We were lulled into a false security when the members of Parliament overwhelmingly rejected the idea of permissive abortion. Now, we realise the deception that has circumvented this rejection. It is abundantly evident that the Government is permitting Medibank and Private Health Funds to finance abortions. Part of it is our money, all of it is blood money. Last year there were 46,000 medical payments of \$65 each under Item No. 6469 of the Medical Benefits Schedule.

Today, Pro-Life Sunday, is a vital one. It is a public manifestation of recognition of God's Law and of the rights of our unborn brothers and sisters. Let us prove resolute in word and action.

Our standard bears the writ of God, Himself, and it runs as strongly as when it was proclaimed amid the thunders that rocked Mt. Sinai: "Thou shalt not kill".

Who is Fr. Werenfried van Straaten ?
"The Champion for Peace"— founder of
Iron Curtain Church Relief and the Inter-
national Building Order. Founder of *Aid to*
***the Church in Need*, the World Wide**
Catholic Relief Organisation for the perse-
cuted and menaced Church. Appointed
Moderator-General by the Holy See in 1964
with special responsibility for the persecuted
behind the Iron Curtain. Irrepressible con-
soler of countless numbers behind the Iron
Curtain from as far as Siberia and China.
Enquiries to 3-5 North Street, Chichester,
West Sussex PO19 1LB.

God Comes Back

*(A Sermon Preached During a Lecture Tour in this Country
last June)*

FR. WERENFRIED VAN STRAATEN, O.PRAEM.

WE are gathered here in this holy place where for so long Mary has bent down in motherly love over this land; where she comforted our forefathers in their distress, strengthened them in the fight and healed their afflictions of body and soul and where she still today keeps her pierced heart wide open for all of us. More than ever, the world of today needs her help and may in full confidence take refuge in her, for Mary suffered the same bitter pains that countless now bear to the utmost. Suffering is immense, for more numerous than ever are the people who are incorporated into the Red Empire. Satan has achieved his goal. The world looks the other way, keeps silence and forgets. And who still has a thought for the mothers who were fleeing with their babies as Mary once fled from Herod?

The refugee mother—no one knows her name—who was photographed in Saigon with her badly wounded child, bore the same care and the same sorrow as Mary once bore.

That other mother—her picture was in a newspaper—with her exhausted face, worn out from the interminable tramp with her child on her back, resting on the baggage in which she dragged her last possessions, she was just as tired as Mary once was as she rested on the flight to Egypt.

And the refugee mother in Angola—what is her name?—her eyes filled with fear and terror, is just as frightened as Mary once was when she heard the laments of the mothers of Bethlehem behind her.

And all the mothers who lost their children when the whole village scattered before the approach of the roaring Vietcong tanks, they are tormented by a thousand fears just as Mary was tormented when she missed the boy Jesus as she left Jerusalem.

And the weeping mothers who witnessed their grown sons being rounded up and taken away to an unknown destination: in the anguished hearts of these mothers gnawed the same pain as Mary felt in her heart when her divine Son was taken away from the Garden of Gethsemane by the soldiers.

As the mothers of Pnom Penh who saw their boys hanging on the lamp-posts in the streets: they are like the Mother of Sorrows whose heart was pierced by a sword under her Son's cross.

And the mothers searching and probing among the ruins and the wreckage of military equipment: when they found their dead sons they were like Mary who wept as she took Jesus in her lap, murdered, dead, pale and cold.

That's how it is with mothers. That's how it is with the Church, too, whose life is characterized by the two dramatic aspects of "fighting without, fears within", already mentioned by St. Paul (2 Cor. 7, 5).

Peaceful coexistence has not brought peace to the Church of East Europe. While the diplomats of the Vatican are negotiating with the Communists without result, the Pope does not cease appealing for prayers for the persecuted church: "There is still the Silent Church which in numerous and extensive areas has been deprived of the right to freedom and life that is its due, according to the generally acknowledged rights of man. Flourishing and peaceful Catholic communities are being oppressed or ex-

terminated and perish in silence in a martyrdom that is often heroic. Let these oppressed brothers know that we do not forget them, but remain true to them in the Spirit and in suffering”.

But the struggle that is forced upon the Church from without is not only raging in communist countries. It is also rampant among us, where anti-clerical secularization and practical atheism, sometimes smiling and humane, sometimes misleading, are poisoning thought, corrupting morals and endeavouring to separate radically God's people from God, often through the dictatorship of press and radio. The Pope complained: “Everything is being secularized, separated from faith and freed from religious principles. The Church is resisting, suffering and struggling as much as it can. It survives because God remains with it and some of its children are strong. But it is possible that these are days of which Christ prophesied: “And because iniquity shall abound, the love of many shall wax cold”. (Matth. 24, 12.)

Still more bitter than the distress to which the Church has been brought by its enemies is the catastrophe caused by the dogmatic deviations, moral offence and disciplinary lawlessness of its own children. To quote the Pope, “Is it not sad that confusion and disloyalty have penetrated into the heart of the Church, often by the fault of those who, owing to the obligations they have accepted and the charisma they have received, ought to be more loyal than others? The destruction of authority in the Church seems to be a liberation to some people, but it is, as St. Peter writes, often merely a hypocritical pretext for vice”.

What is the Answer?

This threefold need of the Church—persecution, secularization and inner decay—requires an answer from us.

We are living in the period after Pentecost. The period in which once the young Church in the strength of the Holy spirit faced the hostile world. She shared her Master's fate. Her children came in conflict with the Powers of Darkness, were dragged before the courts, imprisoned in dungeons and thrown to the lions. “But they rejoiced to suffer humiliation for His name's sake”.

Countless numbers are now suffering the same fate. The end of the long column of those climbing Calvary is not yet in sight. The late Cardinal Mindzenty has reached the goal of his way of the cross, but our Vietnamese brothers and innumerable others are still on the way. An ocean of suffering floods the Kingdom of God. Everywhere the Church is in need.

It is not easy to rejoice in suffering for Christ's sake. It is true that the cross loses its weight when we surrender to the will of God, and that our love of Christ gives us strength to bear crosses that seem unbearable. Undoubtedly God still chooses the weak to confound the strong. But as with the first Christians, who comforted one another, today too God has provided human help for our suffering brothers.

At least some of these suffering brothers should now be in your thoughts. For instance, a Czech priest who has gone through two years in a Nazi concentration camp, five years in socialistic prisons, eight years in uranium mines and three years breaking stones for street construction. After his rehabilitation during the "Spring of Prague" he wrote: "Today is the first time I have been allowed to celebrate the Holy Mass in a church. Now everything will become good again". Unfortunately it did not become good. One year later he was expelled from pastoral work and after one month he suffered increasing paralysis as a result of radioactive radiation received while working without protection in the uranium mines. Now he is a cripple.

Some weeks before his death a 35-year Old Jesuit who was not allowed to work as a priest wrote to a confrere in the West: "Dear Confrere, I am sending you the cross which I have carried for years. When the standard bearer is killed another man takes over the flag from his dead hand. It is not important who carries the flag to victory but it is important that it be carried to the end. If you ever land in India my cross will at least reach the mission fields. I am not allowed to use it here". He died without ever working as a priest.

Thousands of priests share his fate. One of them wrote: "The lack of priests is increasing more and more. About 30 priests died this year in our diocese, mainly of heart failure.

Only two were ordained. Fifteen candidates for the priesthood were denied entrance into the seminary. Many priests are forced to retire or do not have permission to be active pastorally. In a neighbourhood village lives a seventy-eight year old priest. He is unable to walk anymore. People take him in a little cart to the church and dress him in the holy vestments. He celebrates Mass sitting down. With trembling hands he serves Holy Communion. The faithful ask God in prayer to keep him alive. They know that after his death there will not be another priest because there are no more priests".

A thousand times Christ waits for the consolation of Veronica and for the help of Simon of Cyrene. He is waiting in vain in the castaway priest who wrote to me: "You do not know what waiting is. It is the essence of our life. Everyday we hope anew for an event which will make it possible for us to live our real life. But everything remains as it is. For 15 years. Waiting wears one out, makes the other nervous. When will we be normal human beings again and when will we be allowed to have confidence in each other?" In the meantime he has been taken to a mental hospital.

These persecuted brethern are the elite of God's Church. It is a task of honour to be one with them. For in Christ's Mystic Body we form a spiritual unity with them which is deeper and firmer than any natural union. If one member suffers all the rest suffer too. The suffering of martyrs is for the good of everyone. Therefore, it is a high privilege to be allowed to suffer continually for Jesus' sake, to be united with the suffering Christ and to have a part in His work of redemption. After Christ it is undoubtedly due to the persecuted Christians behind the Iron Curtain that the Church, even in these dark times, is Holy Church, the Bride of Christ in whom, in spite of the treachery of so many of her children, God is well pleased.

The first Christians were filled with respect for their brethern who suffered persecution for Christ's sake. The martyrs were the very first to be honored as saints. The Eucharist was celebrated on their graves to express and strengthen our spiritual union with the sacrifice of their lives. In these days there is little to be felt of this union.

Although for fifty-nine years the Church has been ravaged by a persecution more extensive, more subtle, horrifying, dangerous and intensive than any other persecution in the past, it is considered by many as a sign of intolerance to denounce this persecution.

Reason for Rejection

Now that the decadent West would rather live in peace with heathens and murderers than with God, the lamentations and the blood of the persecuted disturb the peace of business people and the activities of the diplomats. That is why the persecution of the Church is being ignored. That is why we are being deliberately prevented from confronting the suffering of the martyrs day and night. That is why the desperate letters of the persecuted are disappearing in the waste-paper baskets of the United Nations and the World Council of Churches. That is why in the great family of the Catholic Church too we are experiencing the loveless scandal that God's best and most afflicted children are being denied and forgotten by their own brothers and sisters. They not only share His humiliation and misery, but from their mouths we also hear His bitter lament: "I looked for someone to pity me but there was no one; I sought for one who would comfort me but I found none . . ."

For the followers of Jesus this loneliness is not unexpected because they know that He Himself, who is God's eternal Wisdom, is rejected by the world. St. Paul already said that the wisdom of this world is hostile to the Wisdom of God. As wisdom concerns the first principles, a difference in wisdom must keep the people widely separated from each other. The cleft between Christ and the world is therefore too wide to be bridged over. That is why He declared to the proud professors, who even in those days represented the world: "You are from below, I am from above. You are of this world, I am not of this world. Whither I go you cannot come, but you shall die in your sins". (John 8, 21-23.)

There is no greater treachery to Christ conceivable than the attempt to bridge over this cleft and to reconcile Him with the world which has hated Him. Rarely have men gone further in this than at present. Rarely has his Divine teach-

ing been so humanly interpreted as in our days. Countless people have been led astray. They have no longer any understanding of Christ's total surrender to the Father, of his obedience unto death on the cross. Recklessly they submit to modern humanistic idolatry, which releases them from all obligation towards God, denies the existence of sin, and plunges credulous Christianity into destruction by a crazy moral teaching, in which everything is permissible and nothing forbidden.

Christ foresaw all this. He knew what He could expect. When the apostles promised to be faithful to Him He answered: "You will forsake me". And when He hung on the cross like an outcast, burdened with all our sins, He lamented: "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" But according to St. Paul His lonely death was no failure (Philip. 2, 9-11): "Wherefore God also has highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name: that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father!" He, the One who is infinitely great, who is lonely and forsaken unto destruction, but bearing fruit for eternity.

This Jesus, forsaken and alone on a cross between heaven and earth, has redeemed us all. To him we owe the happiness of being Christians with the ideal St. Peter holds before us: "Christ has suffered for us, leaving for us an example that we should follow in His footsteps". That means: only if we love Him, are united with Him and follow Him do we possess the ransom for our sins and the key to the Kingdom of Heaven. Our unity with Him should therefore be more precious to us than all treasures on earth.

But no one can be united with the Lord without sharing in His suffering and cross. So the Church is nowhere so flourishing as where she is suffering persecution or is in need for Christ's sake. And she is nowhere so in need as where she flees from the forsakenness of the Crucified.

It is the basic law of Christianity that like the grain of wheat we must die in the earth in order to bear fruit for eternity. Therefore, one day we too shall come to our Calvaries. Perhaps in a lingering illness or when a death takes

from us what we love most. Perhaps in our grief for a child who has gone astray, in injustice or failure, in the loneliness of old age, in poverty or in the terrible persecution of the Faith that is perhaps coming to us too. We do not know when the hour of our Calvary will come. We only know that God does not let anyone be tested beyond his strength. And we can only hope that our faith will stand the ordeal of suffering.

So keep your gaze fixed on the Man of Sorrows, who is crucified in millions of our brothers in the Faith. Do not let the little everyday troubles so occupy your mind that you forget the day on which you must take on your shoulders your last and heaviest cross. Fight against your anxiety of what others may think, against your cowardice and fear of suffering, against your passions and sins. Exercise yourselves in bearing the little crosses that God entrusts to you. Deny yourself something — a pleasure or something else you can do without — to lighten the burden of the cross that Christ's chosen ones must bear. And implore God to give all lonely persons bearing their crosses the strength to share the fate of Jesus forsaken. Pray in this intention for the Church in need, for you yourselves and for me.

Sinful But Victorious

Above all it should not discourage us that we are only poor and weak sinners. There is nothing new in this. For the young Church was recruited from sinners, and of sinners the Church will consist until the end of time. Once she died in the catacombs and at the teeth of the lions. But she was victorious. Today she dies in the concentration camps of the East and from the treachery of priests and professors in the West. She suffers defeat after defeat. She is scorned by her foes and discredited by her own children. She is the weeping bride of the Man of Sorrows. But she is victorious. For under the ragged dress of her littleness is hidden Christ, the Captain of the martyrs, the oppressed, the disinherited and the prisoners, who are the elite troops of the Kingdom of God. And again and again He chooses the weakness and foolishness of the world to shame what is strong and clever.

If we believe in the cross we must also believe that the blood of the martyrs is the seed of Christians. We must remain calm in the storms that rage in our hearts and in the world. Not trusting in our own strength. Not looking for salvation to the great powers of East or West but trusting in God alone, who casts down the mighty from their thrones and raises the humble.

Just as the Jewish people were formerly caught between the great powers of this world, so are the present-day People of God. In early times the Jews thought it safer to make a pact with the pagan Egyptians. This offended God. Let this be a lesson to us. If in our present situation we rely on human aid, the word of God once spoken to the Jews may apply to us:

"Woe to the rebellious children that take counsel but not of me, that conclude agreements, but not of my spirit, that they may add sin to sin; that walk to go down to Egypt and have not asked at my mouth; to strengthen themselves in the strength of Pharaoh and to trust in the shadow of Egypt. Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help; and stay on horses, and trust in chariots because they are many, and in horsemen because they are very strong; but look not unto the Holy One of Israel, neither seek the Lord . . . They were all ashamed of a people that could not profit them, nor be a help nor profit, but a shame and also a reproach". (Is. 30-31.)

The crisis of our faith is in an advanced stage. We are choked by humanism. We do not trust in God even to save the Church. We look for deliverance without Him: a conflict between China and Russia, a shield of American atom-bombs or a compromise with Communists. That is our weakness. For God cannot share our trust with another. He demands everything. Only if we trust in Him alone will He remain with us. It has already been proved dozens of times that only then will the Communists be converted. Then He will conquer Russia with a handful of authentic Christians. And Satan who is roaming the world to devour souls will be driven by Divine Power back into Hell.

It is long ago since God by His incarnation came down into His creation. The Church has celebrated this joyful

event again and again, but over and over again famine, injustice, terror, blood and tears spoil the festive mood. And the miracle of the Word that was made flesh in order to dwell among us has become unworthy of belief for countless people who are waiting in vain for the radical transformation that the return of God into the world should should bring about.

The prophet Isaiah has described the signs that must accompany this transformation: "The wilderness and the dry-lands will exult and the wasteland rejoice and blossom and bring forth flowers like the crocus. Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened and the ears of the deaf unsealed, then the peoples will hammer their swords into plough and their spears into pruning knives. Nation will not lift sword against nation, there will be no more training for war".

The total absence of these signs of salvation must lead us to fear that God, who has come again and again to His own people, has once again not been accepted by them. The signs of disaster that now throw us into panic seem to confirm that God is absent. For if it is true that God came to us in order to bring the world life, peace and happiness, then it must have unforeseeable consequences and bring about catastrophies like war, murder, unbridled self-will and the decay of civilization when God is banished from his creation.

Where God is no longer, gaps are made which no one and nothing can fill. Gaps in legislation, in men's hearts, in morals and in social life. The tyrants who take God's place can only maintain their power by illegal, heartless, immoral, unsocial and inhuman means. An irrefutable proof of this is given us by Communism. It has banished God and called in the devil.

But to see God's banishment there is no need to turn to the Communist world. In our own midst, in the name of a liberal or socialist humanitarianism, the Son of the living God, with His passionate love for the heavenly Father and for immortal souls, with His law of the cross, with His inescapable demand of obedience, humility, chastity, self-denial and poverty, is being banished from press, radio and

television, from preaching and catechism, from marriage and education, from churches and tabernacles.

A World Without God

We have often pilloried godless Communism, but we must admit that almost the whole world (including a part of the Church) has become godless. That we have abandoned God. That we live without God. That God is gone. For if He were with us the world would look different.

God is present in creation by His law, in which the meaning of life is anchored. Trees, flowers, sun, wind and all other things, as also animals, fulfil this law from inner necessity. If there were not man the vast body of the world would breathe peacefully and grow harmoniously because it would be animated by God, whose law would be fulfilled without hindrance.

But there is man with his freedom. With the possibility of deciding for or against God. With the power to say no. When God commands he may rebel and answer: "No, God, there is no need for me to do that or you should not ask it of me. Order someone else. I won't do it". And the incomprehensible God does not crush this man to nothing but allows His law to be pushed aside. And as He is one with His law He allows Himself to be pushed aside too. So man can reject God. He becomes the leaking hole in creation. Through him God's life and animating spirit flow out of the world. So man becomes the door through which God leaves the world.

Now look around you in this world. See how terribly cold and dark it has become. For God, who is light and fire, is gone from the United Nations, from the parliaments, from international conferences, from politics, from legislation, from education, from morals, from many sermons, from the hearts of millions of men. God is gone. But His absence bears eloquent witness. Declares insistently that we cannot live without Him. Is the irrefutable proof that He is the One who is indispensable and utterly necessary, without whom life has no meaning.

Once the Spirit of God hovered creatingly over the waters, and everything was very good. But take away the

spirit from a man and he is no longer a man. He is a wreck or a beast against whom we must arm ourselves or whom we lock up in a lunatic asylum. And drive away the Spirit of God, guiding and animating all things, from society, and the world returns to chaos. Creation becomes an insane beast, devouring its own children. Night over the earth. That is the point we have reached.

God is gone. But every man is also the door through which He wants to come back. Once He came back through the sacred humanity of Jesus Christ. Not now; in the millions of new humanities that are ours, He seeks access to this age for the rescue of His Father's lost flock. For in our days it is not a question of one lost lamb that has to be brought back. The love that is the mark of God's sheep has died in many. And where love is dead God has lost his flock. This should be a matter of anxiety to us, but it should not discourage us. For this is God's word: "I am going to look after my flock myself and keep all of it in view. As a shepherd keeps all his flock in view when he stands up in the middle of his scattered sheep, so shall I keep my sheep in view, says the Lord".

It is encouraging that God is never resigned to the loss of those who should belong to him eternally. Although no one has seen him and he lives in inaccessible light, he has not hesitated to leave his solitude and to begin the fearful search to find his lost flock. Incomprehensible mystery of the incomprehensible God who leaves his heavenly glory to follow after his strayed animals. He had Gospels full of parables written to show his care for all who are poor and lost:

His Message Now

This care is also for the lost sheep of our time. For Christ in his parables did not mean the road from Jerusalem to Jericho, nor a piece of desert in Trans-Jordan or in Syria. In reality he spoke of the favelas of Rio, of the hovel-covered hills surrounding Caracas and of the carpet of misery that covers Catholic South America like leprosy. Not *one* sheep is lost there but the whole flock. There millions of brothers plundered by robbers are waiting in vain for the Samaritan who never comes.

And Christ did not tell the story of the rich miser for the sake of that one beggar who in Abraham's bosom had long since recovered from his misery, but for the sake of Lazarus who in Asia and Africa today is starving in his millions before the closed doors of *our* prosperity. And it was not enough for him to announce the setting free of the prisoners and the persecuted suffering under Herod's reign of terror, but he also thought of our age, in which, behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains, a third of humanity has to live under red dictatorship and is robbed of its freedom and human rights.

Christ refuses to belong to the past. He wants to be more than a vague figure read of in two-thousand-year-old parables. He wants to be our contemporary. He wants to live on in His Church. What He did long ago in His own human shape He wants to repeat until the end of time in all those who bear His Name and who feed on His most sacred body and blood. He wants to break through the framework of His historic existence to go out again and again to look for His lost sheep for love of His Father.

God is gone, but He comes back into the world if we give Him room in our hearts. If we accept Him in His law of love, if we fulfil Mary's task: to conceive Jesus and to bear Him in us so that He becomes the heart of our life. Then He will love the heavenly Father with all our heart, with all our soul and with all our strength. Then His love, His goodness, His pity for men will shine out through us like a light in the world. Then He will smile through our eyes, help with our hands and live anew in us His redeeming life of long ago. Then we shall be the doors, the thousands, the hundreds of thousands, the millions of doors, the gates open wide, through which He, the Lord, the Prince of Peace, the God-with-us, will come into His world, into His Kingdom.

Yes, come, Lord Jesus, come to set us free, show us your face and we shall be saved. O Emmanuel, our King and Law-giver, Expectation and Saviour of the nations, come to our help, O Lord our God!

The military engagement between Ethiopia and Somalia, and the armed clashes between Egypt and Libya pose problems for the Warsaw Pact countries with their special interests in the area.

Warsaw Pact Countries and Africa

CZESLAW JESMAN

IT was only a few weeks ago that an Ethiopian mission visited Belgrade, Sofia, Prague and Warsaw. In each of these capitals it signed treaties of co-operation and cultural exchanges. The open drive of the Somalis of the Ogaden to detach themselves from Ethiopia began almost simultaneously in early July, and then there was the flare-up between Egypt and Libya. Neither of these momentous developments were altogether unexpected. Both of them must also constitute a major setback to Soviet prestige and the Soviet presence in Africa. Soviet-built Egyptian tanks have fought Soviet-built Libyan tanks on the old World War II battlefields, where the British 8th Army beat the German and Italian armies under Rommel. In the Ogaden Desert the Soviet-armed Somali irredentists are inflicting heavy casualties on Soviet-armed so-called "Marxist" Ethiopian militias in the Horn of Africa.

The Warsaw Pact allies of Moscow have a substantial, if indirect, stake in these conflicts. Their participation in Africa goes back many years. In 1958 Guinea severed all constitutional links with France, its erstwhile colonial master, and refused to join a sort of commonwealth of French-speaking African countries under French protection. Bulgaria was one of the first countries in the world to acknowledge Guinea's full sovereignty. From then on, the Soviet Union and its Warsaw Pact allies usually granted enthusiastic recognition to the emerging sovereign States in Africa. They were hailed as examples of the victory of socialism over obsolete colonialism. Most of the African

countries also expected the East Europeans Peoples' Republics to take an active part in the economic and social restructuring of the newly proclaimed independent States of Black Africa. Thousands of African students made their pilgrimages to the USSR and other East European States in search of higher education.

By and large, judging from the results and experience of the last 15 years or so, the project was not an altogether unqualified success. All the European Communist countries set up African Institutes and organised Societies of Friends of Africa. Most of them despatched groups of specialists to every corner of Africa, ranging from air crop-spraying pilots to archeologists and epidemiologists. The background of these ventures was somewhat equivocal. On the face of it they were all *bona fide* ventures. The need for specialists of every kind in Africa is obvious and pressing. The more the better. In the late sixties and early seventies the US Peace Corps filled the gap up to a point. Their often selfless efforts were consistently denigrated by the Warsaw Pact mass media. On the other hand, their own candidates to assist the emerging States of Africa were usually neither plentiful nor, apparently, openly enthusiastic. Most of them—Bulgarian doctors in Somalia, Polish mountain climbers and university lecturers in Ethiopia, Czech radiologists and nuclear scientists in Zaire—went to Africa partly, it became apparent to escape the drab reality at home. Of course, a number of idealists was also present. But they constituted a minority. They are still there—paid by their respective governments. Whether they contribute significantly to the technological awakening of Africa is a debatable point. Doubtless they contribute, in some degree, towards understanding between Africans and Westerners, although their task is not made easy by their own authorities. The point arises, however, at what cost, for whose benefit, and how.

It is common knowledge that African students in East European and Soviet institutions of higher learning benefit from the so-called "soft tariff" at seminars and examinations. In Poland, Romania and Hungary at least, a year-long language course precedes more specialised studies. A fair proportion of Africans are unable to master these fairly complex languages in the prescribed time. Others are super-

ficially proficient, but unable to grasp the finer points of colloquial Slavonic idiom. Their technical or professional training therefore suffers. Already, some years ago, Ghana was forced to introduce an evaluation exam for all graduate doctors returning from the USSR with medical diplomas.

Cultural exchanges, an important component of every agreement or treaty between African and Communist countries, are usually a dead letter. African ballets sent to East Europe within their context do provide a novel experience to audiences; in Prague, Dresden and Warsaw there are respectable Institutes of African and Oriental Studies. In Budapest exquisite textbooks, generally in English and French, on African art and folklore are produced in large quantities. Whether these efforts would produce long-term tangible results remains uncertain.

All these activities cost lots of money in hard currency, notoriously scarce in East Europe. The project was credible while the assumption that the Soviet Union went from strength to strength in Africa was valid. But, now that Soviet clients and ex-clients are falling out with each other, often using Soviet arms to do so, the question arises whether the proposition is any longer acceptable in purely economic terms for the Soviet Union's Warsaw Pact allies. These countries often have to supply Soviet orders for military hardware for Russia's African clients but, increasingly, see little return in terms of trade.

Yet, on the 27 of July last (or 29 Hamle 1969 according to the Ethiopian Calendar) the *Ethiopia Herald*, the official daily of the Marxist Junta announced that a "Peoples' Polish Central Administration of Civil Aviation", headed by M. Romanowski, its Director, arrived in Addis to sign an Agreement with the Ethiopian Air Transport Administration: the Agreement provides for direct communication between Ethiopian and Polish capitals. Shortly before this the air-link between Addis Ababa and Dire-Dawa, the principal marshalling yard of the Jibuti-Addis Railway, was cut. The Ogaden insurgents against the Ethiopian "Dergue" made it impossible, thereby, to operate the Dire-Dawa Airfield. Two months earlier, Ethiopia and Poland signed a trade agreement in Warsaw. This was, of course, not worth the paper it was signed on, to either side, but the Air Agreement indicates clearly which way Soviet supplies to Ethiopia will be coming, and who will pay for them.

This month sees the Diamond Jubilee of Fatima. In honour of the great occasion this prize-winning essay is published.

The Fatima Message

REV. FR. SCAHILL

FATIMA has interested me for the past thirty years. I went there on pilgrimage in 1971. Interest changed to enthusiasm. I wanted to tell everybody: "Fatima is a Voice—mighty, impelling—from Heaven! The Voice of Our Mother! Fatima has secrets for every heart, promises to give all; secrets and promises which have in themselves the power to conquer the world".

Archbishop Sheen, in his book, *The World's First Love*, alludes to a thesis in the theology of the Russians before they were overwhelmed by the cold heart of the anti-God. This thesis holds that when the world would reject Our Lord as it has done today, on that Dark Night the light of His Mother would arise to illumine the darkness and lead the world to peace. The Lady who appeared at Fatima has been described as Our Lady of Light. She was brighter than the sun, and Her apparition took place in the very month the Bolshevik Revolution began. It was a proof of the Russian thesis that when the world would fight against the Saviour, He would send His Mother to save us.

The message of Fatima resembles the Rosary insofar as it is very simple and yet very profound; adaptable to all ages and all classes. It is a message that can be summed up succinctly in phrases well-known. The appeal of the Sorrowful and Immaculate Heart of Mary, calling on us to pray and make sacrifices for sinners, to say the Rosary, to consecrate ourselves to Her, to wear the Scapular of Mount Carmel, and to carry out the devotion of The Five First Saturdays—all in reparation, that is the message. But there is a deep meaning here for anyone who is really interested.

Fatima the Focal Point

The last three Popes have spoken so warmly and acted

so strongly in favour of Fatima that theologians have felt it incumbent on them to face the challenge of our Lady's declaration: "God wishes to establish in the world devotion to My Immaculate Heart". Sister Lucia has written with such conviction in her *Memoirs* that leading mariologists have been moved to study Fatima contemplatively. Many informative publications have emerged. The best post-Vatican II book on Fatima for popular reading was published in 1972 under the title, *A Heart for All*. Then, in 1974, the Church received the impetus of *Marialis Cultus*. This generated renewed devotion to Our Blessed Mother. Mariology spread not only in print but on tape as well. A cassette tape labelled *Fatima and Church Approval* gives telling quotes from Popes, Bishops, theological experts and Vatican II documents. It shows convincingly that the Holy Spirit is working in the Church through Fatima in a way that is completely ecclesial. That, surely, is very big news.

Almighty God has, as it were, decorated His Church through the centuries, with the flash and glitter of the miraculous, the wonder, the vision. At such times the veil is lifted and a touch of Heaven is revealed. Witness what happened at Guadalupe, at Paray-le-Monial, at Rue du Bac, Lourdes and Fatima. The last three mentioned are the landmarks in the Marian era. Fatima understands Lourdes and Rue du Bac. It seems that Fatima is the focal point. We therefore have to ponder well the dignity and the role of the Messenger who appeared at Fatima if we are to understand her message. The Lady of the Rosary is Queen and Mother; a most powerful Queen, a most kind Mother; eager to use Her most powerful intercession in order to help us Her earthly children. She is called the "*Omnipotentia Supplex*" which really means the Woman God cannot refuse. She is the comfort of the afflicted and the refuge of sinners. She it is who can cool the fire of war, lift us out of the muck of sin, satisfy the longings of a tired world lonely for God, effect the conversion of Russia and bring us peace.

Our world finds itself on the eve of tremendous happenings, breaking forth from the East. A prophet of our time, Alexander Solzhenitsyn is pessimistic. The barometer of the Church and the world announces stormy weather.

Atheistic Communism is gaining ground in the world and modernism is growing within the Church. "The smoke of Satan has entered", laments the Pope. Hell seems to be let loose.

But there is Fatima. And Fatima proclaims that God will not abandon His people. Our loving God reveals Himself through the Virgin of Fatima in a "Mariophany" that is full of human feeling. This is the way that is completely merciful and it is willed now by God as a challenge to our times. The Blessed Virgin, refuge of sinners, is stronger than all the hosts of error, and the Maternal Heart of Mary offers to save the world. The revelation of the Heart of Mary in Fatima is, above all, a demonstration of the fact that we have a Mother whose Heart is ever watching over us. As the Vatican Council very well says: "For, taken up to Heaven she did not lay aside this saving role, but by her manifold acts of intercession, continues to win for us gifts of eternal salvation. By her maternal charity, Mary cares for the brethren of her Son who still journey on earth surrounded by dangers and difficulties, until they are led to their happy fatherland".

Prayer, Penance, Reparation

According to Abbé Richard, Mary has a life in heaven, a sequence of living actions, just as she had while on earth. In the mysterious providence of God, Mary's approved apparitions are incidents of her heavenly life which break visibly through to earth. It would be a big mistake to say that we are free to reject any or all private revelations, that we can afford to take them or leave them. Abbé Richard tells us that Fatima belongs to the category of "private revelations with a public purpose". Bishop Vencancio observes that because humanity so often turns a deaf ear to the voice of the Church, God sends His Immaculate Mother to remind us in an extraordinary way . . . Fatima is divine intervention, explosion of the supernatural, heaven speaking in our time, Mariophany of 1917 renewing Mariophany of 1531 to emphasise how truly Mary is our Mother, how close she is to us. "Am I not here, Who am your Mother"? This is the core of her message as it comes down the years from Galilee to Guadalupe, from

Guadalupe to Fatima. She is the Mother of the whole Christ, head and members, Mother of the Church, always our Mother. If we observe attentively the spiritual panorama of our days, within and without the Church, and confront it with the message of Fatima we can see that Fatima is an anticipated answer to the problems posed to the men of to-day; to Christians to-day. Our Blessed Mother offers to save the world, but she asks our co-operation. Her clarion call is for prayer, especially the Rosary, for penance and, above all, for reparation. Her deep concern is the conversion of sinners.

We must pause here to consider a point of the utmost importance. Sanctity is not to be identified with extraordinary happenings but, rather, with fidelity to the grace of God. Charismatic graces, such as visions and revelations, do not by their very reception make the recipient holy. Rather their purpose is some other kind of benefit for the community or the Church. True sanctity is already germinating in the grace of Baptism and Confirmation. It is for us to correspond with the graces that are actual and sanctifying. The call of God is a simple matter of every day. It is programmed into our daily duty, according to our state in life. How very practical Our Lady is when she tells Lucia that the kind of penance she wants is the sacrifice necessary to fulfil one's daily duty and to cease offending God. Fatima asks ordinary holiness to take on the characteristics of consecration and reparation. It asks this of heroic holiness too, as is evident from the lives of the Children of Fatima.

The call for reparation is very clear from the Angel's answer to the only question put to him by the children. It happens in his second apparition. "Make everything you do a sacrifice and offer it as an act of reparation". It is very clear, too, from Our Lady's apparitions. In Fatima everything speaks of solidarity, of reparation. It belongs to the Pauline doctrine of mutual responsibility of members of the Mystical Body of Christ, the doctrine so well propounded in Pius XII's encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*, written just after the consecration of mankind to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. Inserted as we are into the Mystical Body of Christ we are, through Him, as one in

solidarity with our brothers; one in grace and one in sin. Hence the need to intensify reparation through prayer and sacrifice. This is the victimal christianity so effectively preached by Archbishop Fulton Sheen. It comes across with sparkling clarity in *Memorias e Cartas* where Sr. Lucia writes about her ideal of Carmelite spirituality.

Reparation and the Blessed Sacrament

Bishop Venancio puts priorities right when he tells us that the best form of reparation is before and in union with the Most Blessed Sacrament. The reparation that Heaven asked for is reparation in union with Christ Jesus for the sins of the world. Holy Mass comes first. Other Eucharistic devotions (Visits, Vigils, Holy Hours) are obviously most efficacious. It is noteworthy that the intention to make reparation is an essential condition for obtaining the full benefits of the First Saturday devotion. In the practice of the First Saturday Devotion we have the exemplification of a reparation that is Eucharistic, Reconciliatory and Marian. Members of the Mystical Body of Christ receiving the Bread of Life, humbling themselves in the Sacrament of Penance, praying the Rosary—all in a spirit of reparation—this is the very epitome of Fatima. And it has potential to go on spreading through every parish in the world. The truth is that it seems to appeal more to the laity than to the clergy. It is challenging for priests to hear what Bishop Venancio has to say with direct reference to the munificence of God, Who makes such generous promises to those who carry out the Saturdays of reparation. "The Father having given us His Son, how can we doubt that He is not ready to give us anything and everything we need? Let us believe, yes, let us believe in the Love of God . . . 'We believe in love', . . . St. John used to say". Priests who are enthusiastic to propagate this devotion will tend the sick, the children and the poor in every way possible. "Let us believe in the love of God".

It is often difficult to express divine realities in human language. When we speak of God being offended by our sins we use the only language we have. The language is human but the reality expressed is beyond the human dimension. For God, time does not pass. It is always

to-day. Our sins are now present to Jesus suffering and dying on the Cross, present with the presence of eternity, present and not future. Pascal thinks of Christ being in agony until the end of the world. The hour of agony is the hour of sin—a hard hour—hard at least from the sin of Adam to the sin of the last human creature. The reparation we offer enters into mysterious heights. It is raised above time and has the characteristics of eternity.

Reparation and the Immaculate Heart of Mary

Dr. Joachim Alonso explains that reparation is to be made to the Sorrowful and Immaculate Heart of Mary because the Holy Trinity had the loving kindness, so full of mercy, to associate the Virgin Mary with the Redemption of Christ. Wherefore we invoke her as Our Mother and Co-redemptrix in the particular history of the Redemption. Hers was a unique participation in the Sacrifice of Calvary, a role not possible for any man, not even for Christ Himself. And it was willed by God. The saving action of Christ was necessary but the saving action of Mary was providential. The sins of Redeemed mankind wound not only the Heart of Jesus but also the Heart of Mary. Reparation to Our Lady is Catholic doctrine and very definitely part of the Fatima message.

Mary of Nazareth who was the lowliest and the loveliest of the “anawim” is now the Lady of the Rosary, assumed into and crowned in Heaven. This is the era of her Immaculate Heart. Her love for us is personal. She cares for us, loves us in Jesus now. She wants us to grow in personal love for her. She wants us to live our consecration to her Immaculate Heart, and she has made this known in a manner fully ecclesial through the action and exhortation of Pope Paul VI on the very floor of the Vatican Council, and in the closing words of *Signum Magnum*, marking the Papal pilgrimage to Fatima in May, 1967.

When Jacinta was dying she promised to pray in Heaven for the Pope, for Lucia and for Priests and she begged Lucia to be faithful in transmitting the message of devotion to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. The intrepid Jacinta had put blood on her words. Lucia has been faithful, so faithful that we now have the reliable assurance of

Dr. Alonso that the Immaculate Heart of Mary is the central message of Fatima, and we have the pronouncement of the late Cardinal Cerejeira that the message of Fatima is the manifestation of the Immaculate Heart of Mary in the world of to-day, in order to save it.

It is significant that the pledge of the Blue Army of Our Lady, so carefully drawn up with the help of Sr. Lucia in 1946, should focus on reparation to the Immaculate Heart of Mary. This pledge-prayer, so profound, so precise, uses the word "promise" four times. We have promises to keep. Our Lady has promised to convert Russia and bring peace to the world. This sounds an exorbitant promise until we consider that it was made by the Woman God cannot refuse. She has only to "lift her finger" and God is already granting her desires. Remember Cana. But recall how the waiters were asked to fill the vessels with water. Fatima asks us to do something. Our inertia is the problem. "Evil triumphs when good men do nothing". We have promises to keep. That's why organizations like the League of Prayer and Sacrifice, the Rosary Reparatory Crusade, The Friends of Fatima and the Blue Army are so very important. They gear us to a concrete response to the requests of Our Blessed Mother. If only we can keep our promises, powering our daily life with the Rosary and the Scapulars, then we can afford to be humbly optimistic about the future. The Woman will overcome the dragon. Fatima points to Revelations, Chapter 12. It is an eschatological happening. It forewarns us to bestir ourselves, to be up and doing. We who know the message of Fatima bear a responsibility. We cannot allow ourselves to sin by omission, by apathy. We should think of Jonas who had to warn Ninive, or the sentry in Ezekiel 33. "But what if the sentry when he sees the invader coming, sounds no alarm to warn his neighbours? Here is some citizen overtaken by the enemy; well, his guilt deserved it. But for his death I will hold the sentry accountable". The censure for abandoning our prophetic mission can fall on us, especially on those of us who are shepherds of the flock of Christ. Fatima is not a one-way street from above. It is, rather, a two-way traffic.

Any Questions

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

Are we still bound to believe that "outside the Church there is no salvation?"

We are, indeed! There is one Mediator between God and man, Christ Our Lord. He founded one Church, and that is the Holy, Roman, Catholic and Apostolic Church. Salvation is exclusively from Christ within His Church.

That truth was stated by Our Lord Himself ("He that believeth and is baptised shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be condemned", and, to the Apostles, "He that heareth you heareth me"). The truth has been repeated infallibly over and over again. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) said: "The universal Church of the faithful is unique, and outside it none will be saved". In the Bull "Unam Sanctam" (1302) Pope Boniface VIII declared: "That there is only one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church we are compelled by faith to believe and hold, and we firmly believe in her and simply confess her, outside whom there is neither salvation nor remission of sins . . . She represents one mystical body, the head of which body is Christ". And so on, up to Pius XII and the Second Vatican Council.

That doctrine, stated so firmly and uncompromisingly, needs to be remembered now when some Catholics are tumbling over themselves in their eagerness to become Protestants or to make a paper Church out of a union of equal "Churches". There is only one Church, the Roman Catholic Church; and, as the Second Vatican Council says: "Everyone ought to be converted to Christ and be incorporated into Him and into the Church which is His Body". To invite non-Catholics to union with the Church short of full membership of the Church is to lead them up the garden path and then slam the door in their faces. What is called "baptism of desire" can be salvific for hosts of people (as it was, in the judgement of St. Ambrose, for the Emperor Valentinian II); but it can operate only for those who are

progressing steadily, whether they know it or not, towards the one Ark of Salvation for all.

If Leo XIII's declaration on Anglican Orders is infallible, what sense was there in the recent negotiations of the Archbishop of Canterbury with the Pope ?

Leo XIII declared: "Wherefore, adhering entirely to the decrees of the Pontiffs Our predecessors on this subject, and fully ratifying and renewing them by Our own authority, on Our own initiative and with certain knowledge, We pronounce and declare that ordinations performed according to the Anglican rite have been and are completely null and void".

That declaration was based on two judgements, firstly that the Anglican Ordinal in use in the time of Elizabeth I and subsequently does not express the nature of the Sacrament of Holy Order, and that, when it is used, it does not effect and confer the Sacrament; secondly that the inadequate Ordinal was used so widely and for so long that the Sacrament of Holy Order was lost in the Established Church. The first judgement is theological: the Pope is stating authoritatively, in full accord with tradition, the essential constitution and constituents of a sacrament, and in particular of the Sacrament of Holy Order. That teaching is infallible. The second judgement is historical. It was arrived at by research into the events of the Reformation in England, including the ideas and purposes of those who composed the Ordinal. Earlier Popes had made careful investigations and had come to the conclusion that Anglican Orders are invalid. Leo XIII and his experts went even more searchingly into the question; and Leo, "with certain knowledge", reached the same conclusion. He meant his declaration to be final; and nothing since his day has emerged to falsify his findings. It has been argued that Leo XIII was infallibly asserting a dogmatic fact, but there is no need to press that argument: the history of Anglican Orders is exactly as he described it.

At least Dr. Coggan's visit to Rome kept open the lines of communication; and truth could flow along them.

Book Reviews

SHORTS

SOME TIME ago the Catholic Truth Society published a pamphlet by Archbishop (now Cardinal) Benelli. Vatican Under-Secretary of State and one of Pope Paul's closest advisers. The pamphlet is, in fact, the translation of a private lecture the Archbishop gave to representatives of the Austrian Government on May 4th, 1976. It is entitled, *The Church and Communism* and, I am afraid, the title is a very bad one for, as a note on the pamphlet's back cover states, "The lecture sets out very clearly *present* (my italics.) thinking in Rome on Communism . . ." Maybe it does, even though I found the pamphlet somewhat evasive, as would have to be the case, no doubt, when a representative of the Holy See has to talk in terms of policy and posture before representatives of a foreign government. Under such circumstances, basic and concrete intentions can rarely be revealed. This is perfectly understandable. What is not understandable is that the C.T.S. should both publish the pamphlet, whose necessary nuances will mystify the ordinary reader, and title it *The Church and Communism*. This is a misnomer. What Archbishop Benelli is treating of — under delicate diplomatic circumstances — is "present thinking in Rome on Communism" This is not to be identified with the objective treatment of the necessary polarization between Catholicism and Communism, as you will find it portrayed in Pope Pius XI's magnificent *Atheistic Communism*, whose fortieth anniversary occurs this year and which has been republished by the Catholic Truth Society in honour of the occasion. This, indeed, is a hopeful sign of the times. I would urge readers very strongly to re-read the great Encyclical at first opportunity. It is more relevant today than ever before.

Prayer is always relevant. It is good to see *Praying Our Prayers* by Father H. P. C. Lyons, S.J. reprinted by the Franciscan Herald Press in America and available from Pro Fide Publications (39, Blenheim Park Road, Croydon, Surrey) at £2.95 (U.S. \$5.00). God alone knows to what

extent prayer is a vital necessity in these awful days of dialogue, open-ended discussion, phoney sensitivity sessions and all the obscene baggage which the late Saul Alinsky placed at the disposal of progressive secularists within the Church; as if any of this monkey business could find any point of comparison, however faint, with the quiet inflow into the Christian and Catholic soul of grace through prayer. The tricksters, of course, will go and prayer will remain. The former in fact, are now on the way out, cackling away as they hustle along like lemmings over the cliff of their wanton ignorance to drown in the ocean of their own endless verbiage. In place of their idiocy prayer is returning, as it must and will. We should turn increasingly to it now. Father Lyons' rather wonderful little book will help us do that.

And prayer is helped by the habit of reading; of quiet consideration given to the things of the Faith. Here, again, help is given by an increasing flow of books that are good because full of sound doctrine. *Catholicism and Reason*—stocked by Pro Fide—has clearly a useful role to play in this regard. Personally, I would say there is nothing to compare—simply nothing—with Frank Sheed's, *Theology and Sumty* (still available from Sheed & Werd in paperback). *Catholicism and Religion* I would rate as a very useful adjunct to Sheed, particularly Chapters 4-15.

Finally, a composite portrait by his friends of one who, in the last years of his life, I had the privilege of having for a friend, as did so many others. I refer to *Auberon Herbert: a Composite Portrait* (edited by John Jelliffe; Compton Russell, £2.00). Auberon was a Catholic and a gentleman. This says everything. With a pang one realises as one reads the pages of this book that their subject was not only representative of the best that could come out of England; but that this best is no longer wanted—here in this country; or, indeed, the councils of what is called so quaintly today “the post-conciliar” Church. The explanation of the present rot in both is found largely in this fact.

Paul Crane, S.J.